

# SEVENTEENTH CENTURY NEWS

DOUBLE ISSUE  
VOL. XIV, Nos. 1 & 2

SPRING & SUMMER, 1956  
EDITED BY J. MAX PATRICK

35-13 76TH ST.  
JACKSON HEIGHTS 72, N. Y.

**LIBRARIANS PLEASE NOTE: THIS IS A DOUBLE ISSUE (Vol. XIV, nos. 1 & 2); the next issue will be vol. XIV, no. 3 for Autumn, 1956. Please note also that our Autumn 1955 issue was wrongly numbered as number 4 instead of number 3 (vol. XIII). We were able to rectify this error on some copies, but not all, before mailing them out.**

**MAIL FOR YOUR EDITOR WILL REACH HIM QUICKEST IF ADDRESSED TO HIM AS FOLLOWS:** Until 5 June 1956, 35-13 76th St, Jackson Heights 72, N.Y.; June 9 to Sept. 9, Newberry Library, Chicago 10, Illinois; after Sept. 10 either 35-13 76th St, Jackson Heights 72, N.Y. or Queens College, Flushing 67.

**THE NEWBERRY LIBRARY** has awarded a Fellowship to your Editor for the three summer months to prepare a checklist of utopian literature & to explore the Library's 17C holdings. He hopes that readers of the *NEWS* in the Chicago area will give him opportunities to make their acquaintance.

**GUIDE TO, & SURVEY OF, THE CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE.** (References are to item numbers; their numbering continues from our last issue.)

I. **RELIGIOUS THOUGHT; HISTORY OF IDEAS.** Puritanism, items 166, 171, 172; Spinozism 167, 173; Anglicanism (Andrewes) 170, (Donne 205-7); Bacon 168-9, 230; Preaching 170, 173, 206-7; Stoicism 173.

II. **DRAMA & THEATER.** Ford 174; payments 175; comedian 176; Shakespeare Apocrypha 177; Jonson 178, 231; Webster 180, 220; Lee 182; Dryden 204; Massinger 220, 230; Fletcher 220, 221.

III. **MILTON.** Darbishire ed. 183; prose 185; attack & defence of, 186, 193; Sonnet to Lawes 188; *PL* 192; *PR* 198; *Lycidas* 196; & Pope 199; & Shelley 195; & Wordsworth 200; & sensuousness 194; & French Biblical epics 201; & Harapha 231; & patience 184; & Michelangelo 187; Milton Sr. 191; Milton Society 189, 190; "Miltonic" 197.

IV. **DRYDEN AND DONNE.** 202-208.

V. **MINOR POETS. POETRY TEXTBOOKS.** Anthology 215; Crashaw 210; Explicating 214; Lovelace 211; Strode 212; Vaughan 213.

VI. **FICTION.** Epistolary 216, 219; Greene 217; Behn 218.

VII. **BIBLIOGRAPHY.** Compositors, printers, publishers 220, 221, 224-5; Biographies 222; Facsimile 226; Microfilm 232; Dramatists 220.

VIII. **MISCELLANEOUS.** Diplomacy 228-9; Rubens 228; Digby 229; Renaissance Papers 230; Boughner 231; Periodicals 232; Holyband 233; Far East 234, 235.

**THE ATTENTION OF READERS IS PARTICULARLY DRAWN TO REVIEWS IN THIS ISSUE BY S. BLAINE EWING (174), ROBERT O. EVANS (183), LILLIAN FEDER (202), GEORGE B. PARKS (216), & CHARLES C. MISH (219).**

**ABSTRACTERS OF PERIODICAL ARTICLES FOR THIS ISSUE ARE** Joseph A. Bryant, Jr., *Vanderbilt*; Robert O. Evans, *Kentucky*; George B. Parks, *Queens College*; & Charles C. Mish, *Maryland*. Dr. Mish is the Abstracts Editor. We have departed from our previous practice of indicating who abstracted an item by means of initials & now give the abstracter's last name instead.

**IF YOU CAN'T READ EVERYTHING IN THIS ISSUE,** we suggest that the following works are the most important: Simpson's *Puritanism* 166; Vernière's *Spinoza* (for history of ideas) 167; the review of Oliver's *Ford* 174; the review of Darbishire's *Milton* 183; Lutaud's article on Milton's prose 185; the abstract of Willa Evan's MLA paper on the sonnet to Lawes 188; the abstract of Robert Adams' MLA paper on *PL* 192; Williams on the *Dunciad* 199; Potts on Wordsworth & 17C writers 200; Sayce's study of Biblical epics 21; the review of Frost's *Dryden*; the review of Davis's *Sandys* 209; the account of Garner's dissertation on Vaughan 213; Day's original article on 17C fiction 216; the Index to Wing 224.

## SECTION I: RELIGIOUS THOUGHT; HISTORY OF IDEAS.

(166) **PURITANISM IN OLD & NEW ENGLAND** by Alan Simpson. University of Chicago Press 1955, 135p, \$3:—At the 1955 Milton Society Dinner, A. S. P. Woodhouse praised these lectures as "the best short treatment of Puritanism," a judgment in which we concur. Gracefully embracing the best of previous scholarship on the subject, Simpson furnishes a lucid systematization of the essential nature & history of Puritanism.

He finds the essence of Puritanism in the conversion experience, the new birth which separates a "saint" from unregenerate natural men & fires him with a conviction of salvation & a dedication to

war against sin. The problem then arises: What is the proper relationship between the converted & the unconverted? Historically the interconnexion is clear: genuine Puritans were always a small minority, but they found allies in discontented men of all classes; in return, the frustrated & disgruntled could exploit the dynamism of the Puritans. Theologically the problem resulted in fission; in England, the Puritan Right (Presbyterians) tried to achieve a national church which embraced all members of the community but was directed by the elite. In the Center, Nonseparating Congregationalists wanted covenanted churches composed of elect individuals to associate with each other & to impose their orthodoxy on the community, permitting none but the converted to church membership. The aim was a church-state partnership to enforce orthodoxy. But an ironic fate intervened. The first generation of zealous converts in Massachusetts seemed to succeed in tribalizing the ideal of the holy community: they tolerated no diversity of fundamentals & confined church membership to saints covenanted together, & they looked forward to a perpetual succession of saints who would enter the church covenant as the work of conversion continued. But the one-party state in which power depended upon evidence of conversion broke down when spiritual intensity decayed: a chosen people could not find enough chosen people to carry on! On the Left were the Separating Congregationalists: in Rhode Island they separated church & state to protect the purity of the one & the peace of the other. The Levellers' method was a democratic, republican government modelled on the democratic congregation; & the Fifth Monarchists worked for a dictatorship of the saints which would bring millenium.

Such in a crude outline which neglects Simpson's finest insights is the basic systematization upon which he bases his exploration of the implications of Puritanism, its attitudes toward reason, social discipline, liberty, constitutionalism, human rights, war & compulsion, iconoclasm, defeat, etc. He rounds off with a discussion of the impact of the Puritan tradition on politics, education, & morality. The treatment of all these is at once so compact & so lucid that we can do no more than refer readers to it.

Simpson's use of such terms as "one-party state," "party line," & "tribalization" suggest his awareness of the larger implications of his study of the Puritans. For the most part, he refrains from drawing such implications. To do so might have weakened his case. For the nature & sometimes the history of any dedicated movement so closely resembles Puritanism as to make its essentials (as defined by Simpson) not very distinctive & far from unique. Substitute *Communist* for *Puritan*, the works of Lenin for the Bible, acceptance of Party discipline for conversion & orthodoxy, & one comes close to deciding, *Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose*. Modern communism too has its elect, its dedication to war against what it regards as the sin of capitalism, insistence on self-trial & self-denial, converts among the discontented of all classes, fissions & fragmentations, perhaps the irony of not finding enough chosen people to carry on. Niebuhr long ago pointed out such resemblances.

Do these resemblances negate Simpson's definition of Puritanism? Only in one sense: they reveal it as a kind of recurrent human phenomenon, not distinctive in its pattern. But the fact that Simpson's systematization has some validity for other movements than Puritanism partly confirms his case; if the Puritan was not unique, his essence may still have been what he had in common with other devoted men. In any case he was distinctive; after all, the Bible is not to be equated with the works of Lenin, nor obedience to God with acceptance of the Red line, nor capitalism with sin.

(167) **SPINOZA ET LA PENSÉE FRANÇAISE AVANT LA RÉVOLUTION** by Paul Vernière. Tome Premier, *XVIIe Siècle* (1663-1715), 800fr. Tome Second, *XVIIIe Siècle*, 1000fr. (*Publications de la Faculté des Lettres d'Alger XX*). Paris: Presses Universitaires, 1954; 774p in 2 vols:—Vernière's goal is to show the role of Spinozism in pre-Revolutionary French thought, but he achieves far more, for that thought was potent throughout Europe. His combination of Gallic clarity, precision & order with sweeping erudition means that these volumes belong less to philosophy than to the history of ideas: he is concerned not to discover Spinoza's authentic doctrines but how they were interpreted, argued, & modified, & what influence they had. For the power & vitality of Spinozism grew not from the rigidity & systematization of its original formulation but from the pliancy with which it could be disengaged from its geometrical form. Vernière therefore guards against what we today find or think we find in Spinoza's works & seeks instead their meanings for their own period—even if they now seem erroneous.

Spinoza left his ideas to make their own way by their own strength into French thought but was forced to aid that process when the French invaders of the Netherlands in 1672 commanded him to an official interview. It was thus that his ideas entered European thought. Libertins, particularly Bayle, were to idealize him into the virtuous atheist. Christians, except for some largely abortive efforts to twist his recalcitrant doctrines, tended to oppose his teachings as monstrous. So evolved the Quarrel over Spinoza, a crisis in western thought which involved the sense & value of Christianity. In it, the philosopher became a symbol of systematic, unabashed atheism.

After clarifying his ground in this manner, Vernière devotes a lengthy chapter to Spinoza & French Protestantism, finding that the contact was one of singular fecundity. The Protestants were better & sooner informed about Spinoza than R. C. Frenchmen & because of their acquaintance with Dutch controversies about him & refutations of him, more quickly saw the importance of Spinozism & more shrewdly analyzed the ETHICS. Their reaction to him was highly significant: most of the Protestants tried to maintain their orthodoxy against him, e.g. Abbadié, Jacquelot, & La Placette who inspired the synodical condemnations of him. They interpreted him in the light of a moderate cartesianism, sometimes adapting scholastic language to that purpose. Others were more original: for Pierre Yvon & Pierre Poiret, Spinoza was a symbol of modern pride, of dangerous intellectualism. More liberal Protestants, seduced by the free spirit of the TRACTATUS, yielded some ground: the biblical exegesis of Leclerc was that of a disciple of Spinoza & Aubert de Versé went further in accepting ideas from him. Moreover, such writers made his ideas accessible. Unlike the Roman Catholics, these Protestants presented no unified front against him. Their view of him was more personal, surer, more faithful; more affected by him.

Enough has been said here to convey the quality & importance of these scholarly volumes. Vernière goes on to write on the penetration of Spinozism into Roman Catholic France, to deal exhaustively with the Spinoza Controversy in chapters devoted to the TRACTATUS & the ETHICS, & then to consider the glorification of the sage by Bayle & by Boulainvillier who dared to manifest his confidence in the prodigious rational edifice created by a man whom his contemporaries regarded as a monster.

Incidental to this total treatment, Vernière makes many important points. For example, he shows how the tremendous importance of Spinoza in the rise of deism in France & in England has been grossly underestimated & in particular, argues persuasively that Spinozism is a chief root in the deism of the libertine utopias of Sadeur, Foigny, & Veiras.

The second volume, devoted to the eighteenth century is an equally important masterly work in the history of ideas. We have no hesitation, then, in recommending this study as a major contribution to ideological history in French culture & because of the centrality of French culture, in European thought in general.

(168) **SELECTED WRITINGS OF FRANCIS BACON**, intro. & notes by Hugh G. Dick, N.Y.: Random House (Modern Library 256), 1955, 636p, \$1.45.—The works reprinted in this convenient volume are entire except for the unfinished Book II of *The New Organon*—commendably so, for Bacon's voice is all too often recorded in castrated versions which allow only his shriller tones on behalf of science, materialism, careerism, & utility to be heard, with the result that his deeper cadences of philanthropy, service to humanity, religious idealism, & dedication to beautiful utterance are ignored. Dr. Dick has provided a long-playing, hi-fi record which truly reproduces the wide range of Bacon's flexible tones. The texts & most of the bracketed translations are those "of the definitive edition" of Spedding, Ellis, & Heath; ("standard" might be a more accurate word, for their text, though generally reliable & certainly adequate for such a collection as this, is not "definitive" in the sense of being based on a thorough collation of available texts & mss.)

Dr. Dick begins with the famous letter to Burghley in which Bacon takes "all knowledge to be my province" & warns against misinterpretations of that phrase: Bacon meant to survey all knowledge, not to master it. Then follow the *Essays*, *Interpretation of Nature*, *Advancement of Learning*, *Clue to the Maze*, 5 selections from *Wisdom of the Ancients*, *The Great Instauration*, *The New Organon*, *A Prayer*, & *New Atlantis*. Brief, essential annotation is added at the end. The result is termed a one-volume "coherent intellectual autobiography," a phrase which has some truth in it, though we doubt that "coherent" is, or ever will be, an apt term for Bacon's life or thought except in terms of psychological ambivalence. Superficially, at any rate, Bacon's coherence reminds one of that of Janus or a chameleon.

Dick provides an excellent selected bibliography with comments rich in discrimination. The Introduction, perhaps necessarily in a

book for the popular market, repeats most of the old chestnuts: Bacon is "the greatest poet of science" (Alas! Lucretius, how art thou forgotten!); Bacon reacted "against the decadent Aristotelianism of the schools" (True; he denounced it, but his debt to it was far from negligible; & the picture he paints of scholasticism—based on 3 years in early puberty at Cambridge?—is far from accurate); the intellectual leaders in the medieval synthesis "were immersed in speculation rather than in observation & experiment" (Surely it is time to face the fact that the lines of demarcation between medieval & renaissance in this & other respects have been fading under the impact of modern scholarship?); "But none before Bacon had braved the outermost limits of terseness" (A sweeping statement, this! Bacon gives an effect of terseness but subordinates terseness to balance, parallelism & other rhetorical devices & to persuasive imagery. The first sentence in Essay 11 could be simply: "Men in great place are servants of politics, fame, & business." Essay 8 could begin: "Wives & children impede men from great enterprises, good or bad." Moreover, anyone who has tried to translate Neo-Latin adages finds that the limits of terseness were commonly braved before Bacon.) And we doubt that Bacon's lavish flattery of James I may be included in the "consummate literary tact" which Dick finds in the *Advancement*. James wrote & talked in unbelievably long, involved sentences which often were lost in their own meanderings. Was it merely tact or a sense of humor & dangerously obvious irony which led Bacon to comment, "But your Majesty's manner of speech is indeed prince-like, flowing as from a fountain, & yet streaming & branching itself into nature's order, full of facility & felicity, imitating none, and inimitable by any?"

Our blimpish comments must not be allowed to convey a false impression of the Introduction. Dick has written an attractive & generally judicious & carefully qualified introduction to well chosen, well arranged selections.

(169) "BACON & 'KNOWLEDGE IS POWER'" S. E. Ren. paper by Wm. O. Scott:—B's contribution to modern thought is best seen if his end goal, knowledge-power, is stressed rather than his methodology, inductive reasoning. (More on Bacon in item 230).

(170) **BISHOP LANCELOT ANDREWES, JACOBAN COURT PREACHER. A STUDY IN EARLY 17C RELIGIOUS THOUGHT** by Maurice F. Reidy, S.J., Chicago: Loyola University Press 1955, 252p, \$3.—This sympathetic treatment of a great Anglican preacher by a Jesuit scholar is evidence of a catholicity which recognizes excellence wherever it occurs. Father Reidy's purpose is to answer the question, What did Lancelot Andrewes preach to his Elizabethan & Jacobean court audiences on the subject of Christian doctrine, Christian ascetical practice, & the relation that exists between the two? The answer is that Andrewes accepted & taught the great fundamentals of Christendom, centering on Christ, emphasizing personal responsibility (based on free will), stressing the necessity of personal effort, & focussing his labors on getting men to act, to perform good works: "Andrewes faced the courtiers, the favorites, the king, & preached Christ, God incarnate, Christ poor, Christ suffering, Christ gentle, Christ reproving, Christ rewarding, Christ threatening, Christ risen; he preached as well the rottenness of sin, the pains of hell, the joys of heaven; the duty of repentance, the rigors of fasting; the monotonous necessity of personal effort in the performance of good works, the solemn obligation of prayer & the propriety of a cultivated liturgy. . . . He preached no 'popular' topics, simply Christian doctrine & Christian moral practice & strange as it seems, the court heard him."

The passage just quoted is typical of the best in the book—passages in which the Jesuit author & his Anglican subject respond with like sincerity & tenderness to their religion.

Father Reidy is not concerned to second T. S. Eliot's *For Lancelot Andrewes* (N.Y. 1929) in promoting a vogue for reading Andrewes; nor does he share Eliot's admiration for the style of the sermons but regards it more conventionally as a corruption of pulpit oratory, popular only in its own age, pernicious in later periods. As late as 1932 it was possible for W. F. Mitchell in *English Pulpit Oratory* (London 1932) to damn such *Metaphysical* or *witty* preaching. But surely our own generation has acquired or is acquiring a capacity for responding to the *Metaphysical* in literature, even in sermons, for delighting in quickness of fancy, far fetched simile, antitheses, puns, conceits, passion, & the discovery of resemblances between disparates? Some of us are even becoming so attuned to all these that we find them not ends in themselves or distractions but vehicles to full & thrilling understanding. Father Reidy analyzes Andrewes' style rather well but still seems to find it extraneous to Andrewes' meaning & a barrier to it. In fact, it might almost be said that the reason for the book



was to rescue Andrewes' precious content from his precious style. For most readers such a rescue was probably needed.

Reidy includes a useful survey of works about Andrewes & a good bibliography. On the whole the study is well written, particularly in the chapters on Andrewes on the Church, Redemption, & the Supernatural. The initial survey of Andrewes' works in their eleven volumes is cursory & tedious & might better have been relegated to a mere listing with brief comments in an appendix.

The author suggests three further studies of Andrewes that might still be made: i. A comparison of his teachings with those of Hooker, Laud, Cosin, Donne, etc. (Reidy's volume & his method could afford a basis for such a comparison); ii. A biography; & iii. A study of Andrewes' influence on the 19C Oxford Movement.

(171) *CHARLES I & THE PURITAN UPHEAVAL. A STUDY OF THE CAUSES OF THE GREAT MIGRATION*, by Allen French. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1955, 436p, \$8.—This book provides a convenient, readable history of England & Massachusetts during the reign of Charles I. Mr. French succeeds with easy compression & considerable resort to original state papers & other mas in giving a clear picture of English institutions, classes, social conditions, economic problems, foreign wars, government, law, religious difficulties, & emigration. Apart from his use of original sources, he depends chiefly on 19th & early 20th century historians, paying surprisingly little attention to economic histories such as *Nef's Rise of the British Coal Industry* & *Richards' Early History of Banking in England* & to works such as *Tawney's Religion & the Rise of Capitalism* & to articles in periodical histories devoted to economic history. French's declared purpose is "to end conjecture about the conditions in England which drove thousands of people to America . . . during the reign of Charles I," and he concludes, "We leave the argument where it stands: if we have not yet proved the spiritual stature of the Puritans we have indeed failed." He does undoubtedly show that Puritans like Samuel Ward, Winthrop, & Thomas Hooker had spiritual stature as well as economic, social, & political motives for emigrating; but that is scarcely a new discovery. Though he repeatedly claims, "ours is the story of the common folk, the very bones & marrow of the Migration," he is able to demonstrate spiritual stature only in the case of leaders & is forced to admit that apart from a few surviving records which have already been carefully studied, there is a lack of evidence about the reasons for the departure of the average man: "we can only scan the lists of men, women, & children . . . & wonder what those names conceal of heartbreaking resolve & desperate courage. Conjecture fails. . . . An epic poem alone could do justice to the silent emigration of those thousands." That being so, why does he indulge in the loose generalization that "The body of New England immigrants were driven by the belief that in England religious conditions were unbearable"? Actually, French adds little or nothing except details to standard accounts of the reasons for colonial emigration as given in standard histories—e.g. *Godfrey Davies, The Early Stuarts. The value of his study lies elsewhere but is considerable; for it satisfies the need for an easily read account of the nature & causes of the Puritan Revolution. Scholars working on 17C literature sometimes know political history but all too often show pathetic ignorance of the complex social & economic facets of the Revolution's background & of the misworking of English institutions which preceded it. Such scholars & ordinary readers will find that French's survey provides them with what they need to know in order to understand the general & many of the specific reasons why some Englishmen emigrated & others stayed home, only to rebel.*

(172) *THE BULLETIN OF THE FRIENDS HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION* usually includes material of 17C interest. The Spring 1955 issue contains a summary of C. B. Hylkema's 2 vols. in Dutch on 17C DUTCH REFORMERS (Haarlem 1900-02), treating chiefly Collegiants, Quakers & individual reformers, with some attention to Cartesianism, Spinozism, & the influence of Boehme. A review of Leif Eeg-Olofson, *THE CONCEPTION OF INNER LIGHT IN ROBERT BARCLAY'S THEOLOGY* (Lund 1954) notes Barclay's confidence that there is a right knowledge of God which is His gift & is neither moralistic nor intellectualistic; however, Barclay's revolt from reason did not entirely escape the pitfalls of intellectualism & rationalism. Abstracts of Quaker interest in other periodicals are also given: in *The Friend* (London): Jan. 1, 1954—review of recent American studies of 17C England; Feb. 5, 1954—a note on John Bellers, a man "typical of what a Quaker should be"; Mar. 26, 1954—T. C. Jones concludes that for George Fox, Christ was transcendent Saviour rather than immanent Principle. An article in *Friends' Quarterly*, Jan. 1954, shows how the Welsh divine Margan Llwyd thought & wrote much like the early Friends, though his spiritual development independently preceded theirs.

(173) *XVIIe SIECLE, BULLETIN DE LA SOCIÉTÉ D'ÉTUDE DU XVIIe SIECLE* (24 Boulevard Poissonnière, Paris, 17e arrt., France), appears thrice yearly. Membership, including a subscription, is available to foreigners for 1000 fr yearly. The October 1955 issue (no. 29) is devoted to *ASPECTS DIVERS DES QUESTIONS RELIGIEUSES AU XVIIe SIECLE*.—J. Truchet in "La Substance de l'Éloquence Sacrée d'après le xvii<sup>e</sup> Siècle Français" considers how preachers of the classical period understood their role & what subjects they dealt with in their sermons on dogma & on morals. He provides an excellent selective bibliography of relevant 17C works. (A comparative study of 17C preaching in France & England would be interesting.)—Louis Cognet in "Bérulle et la Théologie de l'Incarnation" lucidly expounds the central theological ideas of "the Apostle of the Incarnate Word." Bérulle (like Peter Sterry & Henry Vane) saw the triplicity of the Godhead analogically reiterating throughout God's works. On the Incarnation, Bérulle's basic idea is that in Jesus human nature is assumed by the divine person of the Word, "de telle sorte que son humanité est comme privée de la personne humaine à laquelle elle devrait correspondre."

In the same issue of *XVIIe Siècle*, J-E d'Angers writes on Seneca and STOICISM in the work of Jacques du Bosc. In his writings for women, du Bosc belongs to the Christian humanists who refute Stoicism but make use of the Stoics. As le philosophe indifférent, he refutes dogmatism with pyrrhonism & pyrrhonism with dogmatism, arriving at Christian mysteries through what he calls "indifference." Du Bosc has a significant place in the movement which runs from Montaigne to Pascal. (M. d'Angers has written extensively on 17C French Stoicism: for a list of these works see his footnotes & also pp. 450-2 in the same issue of *XVIIe Siècle*. These articles are particularly commended to those who have profited by reading the works on 17C Neostoicism edited by Rudolph Kirk & published by Rutgers U. Press).

Among the short book reviews in no. 29 of *XVIIe SIECLE* are treatments of Auguste Bailly, *MADAME DE SEVIGNÉ* (Arthème Fayard, Coll. *L'Homme et son Oeuvre*)—Her life (*Quelle vie!*) mirrors its period;— & Madeleine Danielou, *FÉNELON ET LE DUC DE BOURGOGNE. Étude d'une Éducation* (Eds. Bloud & Gay 1955)—Fénelon was able only to develop the prince's native gifts, not to make him into a great writer or general.

## SECTION II: DRAMA & THEATER

(174) *THE PROBLEM OF JOHN FORD* by H. J. Oliver. N.Y.: Cambridge University Press (distributed for Melbourne University Press), 1955, 154p, \$4.50. Review by S. BLAINE EWING, *Lehigh*:—This book takes its place among other full-length modern studies—by Sargeant, Ewing, Sensabaugh, & Davril. It is important by virtue of its maturity & sensitivity to biographic, dramatic, & poetic values, but falls short of distinction because of the brevity with which some important controversies are handled.

The book is arranged according to chronology. The first chapter, "The Dramatist in His Age," describes the changed attitudes toward authorship & toward subject matter in the 17C, & gives a quick outline of Ford's life, ending with a table of works on which the rest of the book is based: (1) non-dramatic work, 1606-1620 (2) dramatic work in collaboration, 1621 to 1625 (3) unaided dramatic work, 1628 to 1638. Chapter II tells what an uninformed reader would want to know about the works in (1), such as their nature, manuscript & other versions, ascription, literary merit, & biographical significance. Chapter III is largely concerned with the ascription of parts of the collaborative plays (2) Chapters IV to IX discuss Ford's principal plays (3) a dozen or so pages to each. Such matters as the following are generally covered: the facts of publication; what sort of play each is; the author's purpose as indicated in the Prologue & his fulfillment of that purpose; the sources; especially, an analysis concurrently of the principal characters & their significant actions, with quotation of the best speeches, & running commentary moral & aesthetic, together with occasional quotation & rebuttal of opposed opinions; features of the play which demand special comment; brief statement of its merits & faults. Chapter X, "Ford's Achievement," praises Ford by contrasting him with Massinger & Shirley, by calling him an experimenter with contrapuntal plots, & by noting the clarity & simplicity of his best verse. An Appendix reviews Harbage's case for *The Duke of Lerma* as "a rewriting by Howard of a play by Ford" (*MLR*, XXXV 1940, 287-319) & argues against it. The book has an Index, but no Bibliography.

The flaw in what is otherwise an excellent book is Oliver's discussion of the moral problem in Ford's plays. Although it is nowhere stated without ambiguity, this is apparently the "problem" of the title. One is plunged at once into it in the opening chapter, not by means of a systematic analysis, but in the form of emphatic responses to Ford's moral critics. Some of these must be

quoted. Answering H. W. Wells on the nobility in Giovanni ('*Tis Pitty*): "[Wells] begins with the assumption that the man with incestuous leanings must be wholly bad & ends in effect by calling a dramatist's ability to win sympathy for his characters a defect. This is surely the reduction of dramatic criticism to absurdity." Answering Bastiaenen's ringing moral condemnation of '*Tis Pitty*: "... Such false assumptions—that poetry ceases to be acceptable when it deals with immortality, that characters who are 'weak' in real life are 'lamentable' & 'deplorable' in drama, that a dramatist is not primarily a recorder but ought to be a 'stern censor' of the morals of his characters & even a protector of the morals of his audience—run through a great deal of Ford criticism (including much of the American criticism)."

This comment leads one to expect that the problem will be fully explored in the chapters on the plays, but one is disappointed.

Lacking a clear comprehensive statement of Oliver's view of the dramatic treatment of moral issues even in the last chapter, where it should be, one may attempt to make it for him: Moral & aesthetic values are entirely separate. A dramatist is at complete liberty to represent any excess or aberration that occurs in life or indeed in his imagination, so long as it is credible & possible & is logically developed, & so long as he has no axe to grind. There can be no possible identification of the characters' views & actions with the views of the dramatist. He is not only not to be condemned if he clothes his errant characters in poetry of surpassing beauty, but is to be praised for the fulfillment of his literary mission. Any criticism which strays from these principles commits the fundamental critical error of condemning a dramatist for doing precisely what he set out to do & for not doing what he set out not to do.

In answer to this position may not one ask simply and directly, Is it possible to separate moral & aesthetic values? Either the author & the society in which the play is created & performed recognize moral values, & the action of the play to them observes or violates the values; or they do not recognize the values, & the play falls flat, its issues dissolved away. Nobody who has read *The Broken Heart* or *Love's Sacrifice*, I take it, has even been persuaded that either Ford or the tortured characters in these plays were unconcerned about issues or denied their existence! What else are Ford's plays about? The alternative critical view, however, is not necessarily the other extreme. One need not declare by moral fiat with Sherman that violations of conventional morality are forbidden. The intelligent alternative is the mean: All of human life is possible as subject matter for drama, & the mature dramatist bears full moral responsibility for what he does with it. That Ford sensed this fact, more clearly indeed than some of his critics have done, is suggested if one reads his persistent claim of amateurism & his patrician air of independence of criticism as an attempt to avoid responsibility or to belittle it. See, for example, the lines addressed to Lord Craven before '*Tis Pitty*. (Gifford-Dyce-Bullen ed., 1.212). Moreover, it is idle since 1944 to discuss the moral problem in Ford without full consideration of Sensabaugh's fine study of it in *The Tragic Muse of John Ford*.

Mr. Oliver's major excellence lies in his perceptiveness in other matters, both minute and great. He has given close, scholarly, sympathetic reading to all of Ford's lines; at the same time has remained alert to the broader reference of each passage to the play as a whole, to Ford's work as a whole, & to the literature & life of the whole era. These perceptions provide most imaginative & stimulating suggestion, read along with the plays. Many are new. I have space to mention only a few of the best in each of several types: (a) critical approval or disapproval expressed without quibble: "One thing is certain: that *Fames Memoriall* has no great literary merit" (10). "There is surely more real passion in this scene in *The Lovers Melancholy* [3.2] than in the whole of *Twelfth Night*" (54). "The dramatist's problem was to present her [Penthea] in her grief as always a pathetic figure & yet not sentimentalize her. I believe he succeeds brilliantly in the task, & he succeeds partly because he refuses to make Penthea completely weak." (66). "What the dramatist has achieved for the first time [in '*Tis Pitty*] is a beginning that is both striking & relevant" (88).

(b) Logical inferences about Ford's literary activity, practices, & point of view: "He writes most convincingly & with most conviction when he is not personally involved. Such a man is likely to be an unsuccessful lyricist; he is a born dramatist" (21). "What we could learn & did not forget was the advantage of basing a plot on a real-life story" (46). "As a matter of fact, Ford uses soliloquy very rarely indeed, particularly for a psychological dramatist" (103). "Ford was never interested in the tragedy of blood. . . . In fact he was not particularly interested in what people do. His concern was with what they think & feel. But to make a play only from what people think & feel is to strain drama to its utmost limits" (120). "What study of his dramatic career

reveals, however, is not satisfaction with his ability to write great verse but a never-ended search for the kind of play in which this tragic poetry might most fitly & most fully obtain expression" (129).

(c) Singling out of Ford's distinctive faults & merits: "He was concerned to portray not the sequence of emotions but the single, static feeling. . . . Continuity, then, was not Ford's strength or interest" (126). The heresy that Ford lacks great single lines (27). "Ford's beautifully clear—but not frigid!—diction" (52). "Ford's particular skill—in suggesting emotion not by words so much as by the absence of them" (53). Of Giovanni, with Annabella's heart on his dagger, '*Tis Pitty*, 5.6: "What this means, then, is that Ford is faced with the problem of showing on the stage a character who in real life would act melodramatically. He had to give a realistic presentation of melodramatic action; it has seemed to many a melodramatic presentation of reality" (95). "Ford may not be the equal of Beaumont & Fletcher in cunning contrivance of situation; but that is at least in part because his gift is the exploration, rather than the exploitation, of human passion" (124).

(175) "COURT PAYMENTS FOR PLAYS 1610-11, 1612-13, 1616-17" by F. P. Wilson. *BodLibRev* 5:4 (Oct 55) 217-21:—Additions & corrections to Chambers' Elizabethan Stage, especially IV.135, 171-81, & to Bentley, Jacobean & Caroline Stage, based on accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber in the Rawlinson MSS.

(176) COMEDIAN. Anna Mario Crinò, "La Visita a Firenze del Zizzaro Attore Comico Joseph Haynes" *English Misc.* 5 (1954) 289-97:—Three letters in the Tuscan archives fix the date of the welcome by the Grand-Duke, & of the joy over the conversion, of the disreputable comedian as November 1686. The monarch had enquiry made by his London resident, but the actor had moved on to Rome before it was learned that all London laughed at the pseudo-conversion.—PARKS

(177) STUDIES IN THE SHAKESPEARE APOCRYPHA by Baldwin Maxwell. N.Y.: King's Crown Press, Columbia University, 1956, 238p., \$4.25:—Four plays are discussed: THE TRUE CHRONICLE HISTORY OF THOMAS LORD CROMWELL 1602 & THE PURITAN 1607, both by "W. S."; THE . . . TRAGEDY OF LOCRINE 1595, "Newly set forth . . . by W. S."; & A YORKSHIRE TRAGEDY 1608, by "W. Shakespeare." Far more scholarship & conjecture have been lavished upon them than their intrinsic merit justifies—though the last has some claim to be an exception. Dr. Baldwin brilliantly surveys & evaluates that scholarship, puts a microscope on the conjecture, & moves on to soundly reasoned judgments & observations of his own, wisely refraining from sensational claims but pointing to what further researches might be fruitful. He shows that CROMWELL divides into two imperfectly related parts which so differ in skill, concept & structure that single authorship is unlikely; possibly Munday collaborated in it with Wentworth Smith & others, perhaps writing two parts which Smith (W.S.) later telescoped.

Among a rich variety of points about THE PURITAN, Maxwell reveals how shocked the Reverend William Crashaw was because the play rather overtly attacked the ministers of Nicholas St. Antlings & Simon St. Mary Overies in London & suggests that this attack may have been the occasion for the discontinuance from acting of the company which performed the play—the Children of St. Paul's.

A YORKSHIRE TRAGEDY is carefully treated in terms of its source, the tract Two Unnatural Murthers, its relationship to other plays, theories that it was revised, etc. Identification of the author(s), if achievable, "must await our clearer knowledge of what were the peculiar characteristics of the various Jacobean dramatists."

(178) "SHAKESPEARE & JONSON among the PAMPHLET-EERS of the First Civil War: Some Unreported 17C Allusions" by Ernest Sirluck. *MP* 53 (Nov 55) 88-89:—The dramatists' works became part of the arsenal of political warfare. The allusions indicate that there was a genuine popular acquaintance with the plays, that play-reading flourished after the closing of the theaters, that Puritans freely drew from drama when writing for Puritans. "New" allusions cited in detail, including some from Milton.—EVANS

(179) AN APPROACH TO SHAKESPEARE by D. A. Traversi, 2nd ed. revised & enlarged. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books 1956, 95c:—Though we try to leave the Bard to Marder's Shakespeare Newsletter, publishers persist in sending us review copies—& in cases like this we cannot resist reading them & commenting on their relevance to 17C studies. Suffice it then to point out that



the Shakespeareans, like the Miltonists & Donneans, are no longer dismayed when their author's passages seem to bear opposite, ambivalent, parallel, or multiple meanings: if the meanings are compatible with the man (his conscious or subconscious), his age, & the context, all or both of them are accepted as valid. Thus Traversi asks whether ANTONY & CLEOPATRA justifies triumphant love or remorselessly exposes human frailty & replies that we should see them as complementary, not contradictory, aspects of a unified artistic creation.

(180) WEBSTER. Mina Irgat "Disease Imagery in the Plays of J. Webster" *Litera* (Istanbul Univ. English Dept., Turkey) 2(1955)1:26.—In his plays, W uses more than 60 medical terms & names more than 30 diseases & about 20 drugs & medicines. The *White Devil* contains more than 50 disease images & comparisons, *The Duchess* more than 60; etc. Thus W uses iterative imagery at least as often as Shakespeare & does so not merely decoratively but organically. Disease is the symbol of the chaotic, sinister world in which his characters move.

(181) For more on drama, see items 220, 221, 230, 231, 204. George Speaight's *THE HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PUPPET THEATRE*. N.Y.: John de Graff, 1955, \$5.50, will be reviewed in a future issue.

(182) (Review continued from item 147 in our last issue): *THE WORKS OF NATHANIEL LEE*, ed. Thomas B. Stroup & Arthur L. Cooke. New Brunswick, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 2 vols. \$15.—In addition to *Nero*, vol. I contains *Sophonisba*, *Gloriana*, *The Rival Queens*, *Mithridates*, *Oedipus*, a General Introduction, & a Life of Lee. Of these plays, *Sophonisba* is probably the best: "suspense, colorful characters, spectacle, & a lofty heroism coupled with tender love expressed in impassioned, sometimes eloquent, verse made a popular play," although, as the editors add, the play is marred by wild extravagances, some weak motivations, & a poorly constructed plot. But these are, for the most part, academic objections: the fact remains that *Sophonisba*, like all of Lee's plays, must be judged primarily as theater; & as theater it is very effective—though less so as a grand unity than in particular strong scenes. But the credit for this achievement does not belong to Lee alone: the tragedy is a product of a long tradition of dramas, romances & histories on African Queens who married Roman generals. Lee did not plagiarize, but he certainly echoed these works, among them Shakespeare's *Antony & Cleopatra*. In short, Lee's greatness here lay less in originality than in perceiving & exploiting the most theatrically effective elements in previous treatments of the *Sophonisba* & *Cleopatra* themes.

Lee's metier was historical romance in dramatic form; *Gloriana* is an instance, though he does tend in it to take the bombastic extremes of the romance genre further than they can stretch without absurdity. However, if his remarks in the dedicatory letter to the *Rival Queens* are to be taken, his own age was one of "senseless Riot, Neronian Gambols . . . hot hours . . . reeling Honour"; if so, extremes were the order of the day & rant was merely a means of conveying simple emotions to jaded sophisticates incapable of sensitivity to anything but the extreme.

One feature of the usually excellent editing needs comment. Such statements as "A comparison of five copies of the first quarto reveals no alterations" could well be made more explicit. If, as may be expected, this edition stimulates studies of Lee, it might lead to further collation. One can never tell when a sixth copy might contain a significant variation. It would therefore be well to state what specific copies were collated. (Review to be concluded in our next issue).

### SECTION III: MILTON & RELATED SUBJECTS

(183) *THE POETICAL WORKS OF JOHN MILTON*. Vol. II: *PARADISE REGAIN'D, SAMSON AGONISTES, POEMS UPON SEVERAL OCCASIONS, BOTH ENGLISH & LATIN*, ed. Helen Darbishire. N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1955, 396p, \$5.60. Review by ROBERT O. EVANS, *Kentucky*.—This volume completes the task of Dr. Darbishire began with her reformed text of *Paradise Lost*, 1952. The Italian poems have been edited by John Purves, the Latin by H. W. Garrod. In editing the rest, Dr. Darbishire generally has followed the text of the original edition & has not tried to impose "upon the Poems of 1645 & 1673 Milton's mature system of spelling & punctuation." She has adopted what she calls a "light revision," using some readings taken from MSS or printed copies & changing certain spellings to those which she assumes are especially Miltonic—*perfet*, *anow*, etc. The general reader may well prefer her version; scholars can consult the textual com-

mentary or look elsewhere to particular editions. With respect to the early poems there is little objectionable in her practice: the stamp of the early 17C, not Milton's post restoration period is upon them.

With respect to the reformed texts of *PR* & *SA* there is more serious question. Darbishire's reformed text of *PL* was generally acclaimed in 1952, but since then there has been investigation of her practices & some sniping at the "rules" she follows (a little by this reviewer). Particularly since the appearance of Robert M. Adams' vitriolic article in *MP* 50:2 (Nov54) 84-91, revised & partly reprinted in his *Ikon*, there has been reason to reexamine her principles to ascertain how sound or eclectic they are. Since the texts of *PR* & *SA* depend on the principles applied in the edition of *PL*, it is necessary to look at it again.

In contrast to what is generally held to be true of *PL*, neither *PR* nor *SA* seems to have been carefully proofread or closely followed through the printers. With respect to *PL*, Adams holds a different opinion, but there is evidence which should not be disregarded; e.g., more than 30 instances of *-ee* spellings (*hee*, *mee*, *ye*, *bee*, etc.) in the MS of *PL* I have been altered in the 1st ed; in fact all such spellings that occur in MS have been changed, though the MS indicates no such intention. On the other hand, *-ee* spellings were acceptable to Simmons, the printer, or his assistants, for there are two new occurrences in Bk I & several others in subsequent books. There is, then, reason to believe that Milton, either through Phillips or someone else, directed many small changes in the *PL* text, of which these are merely examples, at the time the poem was in Simmons' shop. This does not seem to be the case with *PR* or *SA*; hence many matters of spelling & punctuation in these poems may well be the responsibility of the printer, John Starkey, rather than Milton. Moreover, it is likely that Starkey would not have been as familiar with Milton's special desires with respect to spelling & punctuation as Simmons might have been. Thus Darbishire certainly has reason for wishing to reconstruct a text which will more closely fulfill Milton's intention than that of the 1st ed. The "rules" which she follows to accomplish this end are those which she claims to have discovered in operation in *PL*.

Miss Darbishire supplies a key-list of Milton's idiosyncratic spellings which, she claims, "would enable an inquirer to identify a given page of print or ms as Milton's & no other's." The list includes *anow*, *buisness*, *childern*, *forren*, *iland*, *sovrán*, *voutsafe*, etc. She implies that Milton preferred phonetic spellings & that had he not been blind he would have ensured that his later works employed such orthographic conveniences. But how "phonetic" these spellings are is uncertain: there is no way of knowing how Milton actually pronounced most of the words; besides, most of the spellings are common if not the usual printed forms. Readers are likely to assume that Dr. Darbishire meant that Milton invented these spellings for his poetic purposes. This is generally not so: *anow* is common in the 17C & as early as the 14C; Dryden used *buis'ness*; *childern* still occurs; *forren* may have been the most common form at the time; *iland* occurs as early as Alfred's *Boethius* & in the Authorized Version; *voutsafe* was Charles I's spelling as well as Milton's. The same sort of thing may be said of every word on the key-list except *sovrán*, which the *OED* lists as Miltonic, though Milton may have been influenced from Italian. His works were printed in an age when printers commonly regularized spelling, if the spirit moved them. About all that can be said of Milton's idiosyncrasies, with any authority, is that compared to many other writers he managed to get a large percentage of them into print. This does not prove that he intended to produce a consistent system; the MS in Milton's hand demonstrate no such consistency. But these are early—before his alleged "system" was perfected.

Whether Milton intended a consistent system or not, there is no question that he was careful about his spelling (despite Mr. Adams' contentions). As readers of Bridges' *Milton's Prosody* know, he usually used an apostrophe (*th'*, etc) to indicate metrical elision. There is indisputably a high proportion of idiosyncratic spellings in his printed works. And there is Milton's own remark to Peter Heinbach, in routine business correspondence, "I was, with no little vexation, obliged to dictate not the words, but, one by one, the letters of which they were composed." Dr. Darbishire certainly has reason to investigate Milton's spelling. But are her conclusions supportable?

Perhaps most spectacular in her treatment of so-called emphatic & unemphatic spellings (*hee-he*; *wee-wee*, etc). The idea had been suggested before Milton's time, particularly by Stanyhurst in the preface to his edition of the *Aeneid*, which Milton probably knew. There is evidence in Milton's hand that he used such variants himself, though there is no indication that he had any particular

system of emphasis in mind. Only about half of some 30 occurrences of such spellings in the MS PL Bk. I fall in positions of metrical emphasis; i.e., about half fall on accented syllables in the verse & half not, though there is always some argument about such matters. There is no way of knowing whether Milton is responsible for all these spellings, some, or none; they may have been entirely the work of the amanuensis. In any case, they are all changed in the first ed, a fact everyone has noticed but to which no one seems to have attached any importance. Two different instances do creep into the printed text of Bk I.245, 257. Both are changed to normal forms in the 2nd ed. The extant textual evidence certainly points to the conclusion that Milton, if he had anything to say about these corrections, intended to do away with such spellings, even though there are several instances of them in later books (for which no MS exists). It is possible that such a conclusion is incorrect, but to retain any of these spellings on the strength of the MS would seem to violate desirable editorial practices. Darbishire retains some, especially in accented syllables; however she does away with the verbal forms. Her practice produces a consistent result but is arbitrary and is apparently based on the premise that in this respect the MS is more likely to represent Milton's intention than the 1st ed.

On the other hand, with regard to polysyllables ending in -e she is inclined to rely on the printed edition as representative of a later stage of Milton's system. Many words (e.g. *brightnesse*, *endlesse*, *boundlesse*, etc) were changed between the MS & the 1st ed. She asks readers to believe that Milton used a final -e in such cases to indicate that the preceding vowel was stressed; thus she prints *obdurat* &, on the other hand, *generate*. This is an example of one of her "rules." To support it there is precious little evidence, & in accepting what evidence there is she seems to be doing the opposite of what she recommended with regard to emphatic & unemphatic forms.

The two examples above cast some doubt on the efficacy of the "rules" by which Darbishire operates. Her general concern, however, with minor matters of spelling seems justified. Milton wrote *ruine* when the word was intended as a disyllable & *ruin* when it was a monosyllable; so Jonson seems to have done. Adams cannot believe in a blind poet concerned with "adding & subtracting -e's," but in some cases that seems to be just what Milton did. Darbishire is right to concern herself with such affairs, but there are certain reasons for believing that she may not have found the final answer. Thus her editions of PL, PR, & SA, while they are of great interest & perhaps considerable help to the general reader, have little value for the specialist interested in spelling, unless he happens to care about the spelling of Milton's editors.

In PR & SA Darbishire corrects some instances of what appear to be obvious spelling mistakes on Starkey's part. But the most notable difference between her text and, say, H. C. Beeching's are those of punctuation, particularly with respect for apostrophes. Doubtless a reading like "By proof th' undoubted Son of God, inspire" is an improvement, from the general reader's point of view, on "By proof the undoubted . . ." (PR I.11). Throughout both volumes Darbishire exercised exemplary caution. In the manner in which she arrives at "rules" there are inconsistencies which cannot but disturb scholars; in her choice of applications, though conservative, they are bound to be incidents to which others will object. However, she is a competent & careful editor, & if her edition produces a text which is in some respects unbelievable, it is worth remembering that she may, after all, be right, even if she has not entirely proved her case. On the whole she brings to her textual study a more mature & cautious judgment, & certainly more experience, than some of her critics. In some respects her practice improves earlier editions such as Beeching's. For most readers who cannot be expected to go to Fletcher or other larger editions, her work should prove useful. If it is not the final authority, it is, nevertheless, unlikely to be supplanted for some time.

(184) "MILTON & PATIENCE" abstract of a paper by Paul R. Baumgartner:—The later books of PL reflect not pessimism but Christian patience & resignation & more mature, perhaps less glamorous, poetic inspiration than previously.

(185) AMERICAN SCHOLARS & FRENCH REVIEWERS. We commend to our readers Oliver Lutaud's "MILTON LE LUTTEUR: Etudes et Editions récentes de la Prose Miltonienne" *Études Anglaises* 8:3 (Juil-Sep55) 233-48 (Published by Didier, 4 Rue de la Sorbonne, Paris, \$4 a year):—Enlightened Restoration & 18C readers left Milton's prose "seldom looked on" (Sonnet XI) because of its hard style, partisan bias, vulgar & outmoded controversial methods, disturbing, morally contestable ends, & the medieval ennui diffused by its knotty titles, strange exegeses,

verbal ambivalence, pedantic references, & confusing presentation. 18C & 19C interest in the prose was sporadic. Frenchmen led the placing of the prose in the history of ideas—Geffroy (1848), Taine, De Guerle, Chauvet, Delattre, followed by the Swiss Vodoz & the Dutch Visser; then by American editions of particular tracts in 1911-15-16-28 & more recently of *An Apology*.

After World War I the ideas in the prose became timely for discussions on authority, divorce, liberty, etc; *Aeropagitica* appeared in Italian, Spanish & German translations (1933-41-44) & was the basis of a London conference in 1944. Since 1920, especially since 1938, numerous works have placed Milton's prose in its real context—the history of pamphlet controversy.

The author amplifies & generously footnotes such statements & his survey of recent critical studies on Milton & the Revolution: Saurat systematized Milton's great effort; Liljegren & Mutschmann made hostile approaches; F. Delattre dealt with Milton as Puritan & artist in his introduction to *Allegro* etc. (Aubier 1937) & in his *Littérature de l'Angleterre Puritaine* (Didier 1942); then came C. Looten, *Milton, Quelques Aspects de son Génie* (Desclée de Brouwer 1938) & P. Morand, *De Comus à Satan* (Didier 1939) & *Effects of his Political Life upon Milton* (Didier 1939).

Lutaud then traces the English contributions by Tillyard, Grieron, Knight, Hutchinson, & Raymond, pays warm tribute to the works of Haller in the U.S.A., & praises the contribution made by the Canadian Miltonists—Malcolm Wallace in his "séduisante introduction" to Milton's prose in the World's Classics series, A.S.P. Woodhouse's systematization of puritanism, & "l'analyse nuancée" by Arthur Barker. After mention of Wolfe's *Milton in the Puritan Revolution* ("put together in the mood of New Deal social research"), Hanford's handbook & life, the recent study by Muir, & works by Zagorin, French, Bush, Hughes, etc, Lutaud proceeds to his main subject, vol. I of the Yale edition of Milton's prose: "One must admire the precision, the certitude, the preservation of the original spelling. . . ." The limitation of the content to prose forces a change from accustomed viewpoints; e.g. the Italian period almost vanishes. Perhaps the abundance of notes was needed: we are confronted by the "most annotated Milton in the world"—an example of old-fashioned Germanic erudition at its best—; however, the (Protestant) preference for sacred texts more discreetly clarified & for commentaries a little less Targumic could be justified here.

Wolfe's introduction amounts to a 210-page history book (which extends even to the soap business); it is "very necessary for the reader who is little informed about history." But Lutaud deplores the absence of a literary introduction to the volume. He applauds the prefaces & their underlining of Milton's erudite purple passages or sarcastic anger & gives particular praise to the introduction, annotation, & text of the Commonplace Book provided by Ruth Mohl.

Lutaud's section on what the pamphlets reveal & his stimulating comments on Milton's prose diction are too concentrated to summarize here.

The review draws attention to various works, particularly by European authors, which, though relevant to the prose, are sometimes overlooked by American scholars. Lutaud judges the Yale Milton in the perspective of history & from the distance of another culture; he is therefore able to signalize the magnitude & significance of the pamphlets & the editing. He stresses merits & significances, corrects deficiencies, makes constructive suggestions, & avoids the pitfalls of inconsiderate disparagement & picaresque picking on the petty which have marred some reviews of the volume. The positive suggestions seem particularly worthy of consideration for future volumes in the series—inclusion of poetic passages directly relevant to the prose; literary introductions to supplement the catch-all political & social approach; & a system of line numbering.

(186) A DEFENCE OF MILTON & other poets against Johnson's "virulent & malevolent reflections" was recently purchased by the Bodleian Library—Remarks on Dr. Johnson's LIVES . . . by a Yorkshire Freeholder, 1782.

(187) MILTON AT THE MLA MEETING. Two papers were devoted to Milton & the Arts. In "MILTON & MICHELANGELO," Maximilian G. Walten, City College, reiterated his belief that some similarities between some details of Michelangelo's work in the Sistine Chapel & Medici tomb & certain lines in Milton's verse indicated influence upon the Italian by the Englishman. In comment Don Cameron Allen, Johns Hopkins, doubted that Milton would write poetry to illustrate the Sistine Chapel & attributed such similarities as might exist to the common tradition of the Bible & commentaries on it, which Milton & Michelangelo shared. By demonstrating significant differences between the treatments given by the artist & the poet to the Deluge & to the crossing of the Red Sea, Allen weakened the argument for influence.



(188) In "MILTON'S SONNET TO LAWES," Willa M. Evans, *Hunter College*, centered on lines 2-4 of that poem. Their obvious meaning is that Lawes was the first English composer to provide musical settings which preserved the metrical pattern, verbal sweep, & original structure of sense in a poem; i.e., Milton was criticizing the madrigalists, including his own father. By means of examples, Dr. Evans demonstrated the difference between Lawes' strict preservation & the elder Milton's drastic destruction of the metrical pattern, thus pointing up what the poet meant in saying that Lawes' predecessors had Midas ears, committing short & long.

Milton's prefatory note to *PL* on versification completes the analogy between the structure of Lawes' ayres & his own verse paragraphs.

"As Lawes had stretched his monody across the stanza, dovetailing musical phrase with musical phrase, postponing the rounding out of a cadence to the end of the song, so Milton should span a paragraph with verbal melody, 'drawing out the sense variously from verse to verse.' As Lawes had set words to *just notes*, so Milton should employ 'apt numbers.' As Lawes had observed *accent*, so Milton should supply 'fit quantity' of syllables. As Lawes had contrived a tuneful & well measured ayre, so Milton should achieve *true musical delight*."

In comment, Dr. Allen warmly commended the paper & raised two relevant problems: how seriously did men of Milton's period hold the view that music is the finest of the arts? How does an understanding of the quarrel between secular & sacred music throw light on the sonnet to Lawes?

(189) THE MILTON SOCIETY DINNER FOR 1955 was, by general agreement, the most successful to date. The presence of 65 members & their guests despite the high cost proved that they preferred a banquet to the pauper's diet of tired chicken which characterized some earlier dinners. The replacement of the endless eulogies of previous years with a dignified, interesting program met with favor, as did the changed nature of the annual booklet. Instead of trite tributes & extracts from the honored guests' writings (both of which had the tone of Podunk Ladies Poetry Society), members found at their places a booklet which reported on the activities of the society, its prospects & purposes, the growth of its library, its constitution, & a convenient list of members' addresses. There is hope that in future years a list of work in progress on Milton may be added. Thus the Society is reaching a maturity achieved by a succession of resourceful executives who experimented until they discovered what form of program & booklet would meet with the widest approval.

Like a blest pair of sirens, Dennis Coward of the University of Chicago Music Department sang the Lady's Song from *Comus*, & Holly Hanford, now of the Newberry Library, accompanied him on the lute. The music was by Henry Lawes.

A tribute to the late F. Michael Krouse was given by Don Cameron Allen who supervised the dissertation on *Samson Agonistes* which was later rewritten for publication by Princeton University Press. Dr. Krouse was outstanding in character & in careful scholarship. On leave of absence from the University of Cincinnati, he went to Holland on a Guggenheim Fellowship for researches on Milton there; fatal cancer, which he bore with fortitude & cheerfulness prevented the results of this research from being published.

Progress on vol. II of the YALE MILTON was reported by Ernest Sirluck, *Chicago*: the editing of its 6 pamphlets & letters is nearing completion despite the complicated textual problems presented by *D.&D. of Divorce*. Differing conceptions about the nature, scope, & function of the Introduction to the volume have ended in a satisfactory compromise; publication may be expected about 1957. (Subsequently at the meeting of English VI, Don M. Wolfe, *Brooklyn*, reported on the general progress of the Yale Milton, claiming that its focus is on intellectual history. He divided Milton critics into 3 groups: those who appreciate only the minor poems & wish that Milton had stopped after writing them; those who esteem all the poetry & some of the prose; & those who so cherish the poet & his works that they regard nothing Miltonic as unimportant.)

After A.S.P. Woodhouse, *Toronto*, reviewed contributions to Milton studies in 1955, Merritt Y. Hughes, *Wisconsin*, reported on THE VARIORUM EDITION OF MILTON'S POETRY. He was dynamic despite the triple burden of editing vol. III of the Yale Milton, revising his Odyssey Press textbooks, & editing the Variorum. The Variorum is to be highly selective rather than comprehensive of dead-end controversies & scholarly aberrations. The editors will digest only significant material, illustrating it with short, pertinent extracts, beginning with Todd, 1801. After a short biographical statement, there will be a long commentary. The appendix will contain essays by specialists on prosody, imagery, etc. Much of the work has been completed for the 3 vols.;

publication by Columbia University Press may be expected in the not distant future.

(190) THE MILTON SOCIETY OF AMERICA: MEMBERSHIP—open to all for annual dues of \$1 paid to Walter P. Bowman, 5331 Baltimore Ave, Washington D.C.; sustaining membership—\$5 a year; life membership—\$25. OBJECTIVES—to advance Milton scholarship, bring Miltonists together at an annual dinner, honor scholars, publish an annual booklet, encourage research, etc. A SOCIETY COLLECTION OF BOOKS & MSS was recently started but already contains 15 books, 82 offprints, 13 miscellaneous items, & a file of the NEWS, all as gifts. Miltonists & their friends are urged to donate books, articles, & learned papers, published or unpublished. Address Herbert H. Petit, Univ. of Detroit, 4001 W. Nichols Rd, Detroit 21, Mich. The collection is now too small to be of much use to scholars but will ultimately be housed accessibly. SUGGESTION:—Add a codicil to your will leaving your Milton holdings to the Society's Library.

OFFICERS FOR 1956: Pres., French Fogle, *Huntington Lib*; V.Pres, Don Wolfe, *Brooklyn*; Sec'y, Wm B. Hunter Jr. *Wofford*; Treas, W.P. Bowman; Librarian, Herbert H. Petit, *Detroit*.

17TH-CENTURY NEWS is recognized by the Milton Society as its official organ for the publication of reports on its activities, etc. The NEWS & the society are bound by a common interest in Milton. Financially the two organizations are independent: membership in the Society does NOT bring with it a subscription to the NEWS; a subscription to the NEWS does NOT bring with it membership in the Society. The official status of the NEWS does not mean that opinions & judgments expressed in its columns are necessarily shared by the Society. The Editor of the NEWS controls its policies & takes sole responsibility for unsigned items in its columns: he writes them. The responsibility for signed articles & notes belongs primarily to their authors. Anonymous contributions are published under the pseudonym "Henry Q. Smuts," a name which indicates that your Editor did not write them & does not necessarily agree with them.

(Incidentally, Mr. Smuts is your Editor's cat.)

(191) MILTON'S FATHER'S SIGNATURE. Catalogue 15 from Emily Driscoll, bookseller, 125 E 40 St, NYC 16, lists a lease granted to Richard Widmer of Hughenden by Wm. Widmer, Anne & Edmund Waller—the poet, Adrian Scrope & Thos. Widmer; on the verso the Wallers' signatures are attested by Milton Sr.—an association which may be significant in his son's life.

(192) PARADISE LOST. The Nov. 1955 issue (vol. V:4) of *Literature & Psychology*, newsletter of the lit. & psych. section of MLA (\$1 a year from the editor, L.F. Manheim, English Dept. 117 Main Bldg, City College, 139th St & Convent Ave., NYC 31) republished Robert Adams' MLA paper "Literature & Psychology: A Question of Significant Form." In it Adams contends that literary form is not invariably the most significant form & adduces *PL* as an example. *PL* is commonly read in two incompatible ways—Satan is heroic; Satan is absurd; hence the appeal of Tillyard's distinction between Milton's latent & overt meaning & the conclusion that the subject of *PL* for cosmopolitan modern readers is the state of Milton's mind when he wrote it. Its intentions though logically disparate are psychologically complimentary & constitute a unity more significant than any realized by the purely literary form. Lewis & Bush personally accept the greater part of Milton's intellectual presuppositions & therefore do not have to transpose Milton out of the dialect of Christian humanism. But the overt & religious meaning of *PL* is dead for most modern readers: the ideology disturbs the poem. The solution is to read it for a less explicit meaning—a psychological one—the experience of a great athletic mind mastering & dominating over intractable materials. This is no ideal procedure; one wouldn't do it if one didn't have to. On the other hand, are readers like Bush & Lewis going to insist on reading Yeats or Lucretius with the same respect for overt subject-matter? Will not such extravagant literalism convert their reader into a sort of intellectual chameleon whose intellectual coloration depends on the book he happens to be holding in his hand? The proper criterion is not the author's intent but the reader's convenience. We read a literary work not to agree or disagree with the ideas expressed in it, but to widen our sympathies & exercise our attitudes by understanding what it feels like to view the world in a certain way, to see life from a certain angle. In this sense the subject of every literary work is the author's state of mind at the moment of composition. Significant form is the one which gives us most ground for sympathy & makes possible the most intense & active cooperation between the reader's imagination & the literary work.

(193) **ATTACKS ON MILTON.** Merritt Y. Hughes "A Meditation on Literary Blasphemy" *JourAesthArtCrit* 14:1(Sep55)106-15:—Ernest Boyd & F.R. Leavis reflect most aspects of the 20C reaction vs Milton. Boyd's blunders encouraged the popular stereotype of the "Puritan zealot" & confused the man, age, style & poem into an indiscriminate conglomerate, which Boyd then denounced. Leavis argues from assumptions, tolerates no sensibility except his own notion of the contemporary one, & twists Freudian doctrine to make poetry impossible for a man of action such as Milton was when Latin Secretary. Hughes exposes the fallacies in these & similar views with a cogency & fire which defy summary.

(194) **"MILTON, DIOMEDE, & AMARYLLIS"** by J. W. Saunders. *ELH* 22(1955)254-86:—The conflict of sensuousness & asceticism within M could well have been irreparably extended by the corresponding division in the taste of the Renaissance poetry-reading public, but he avoided this danger to his personality & his art by engaging & mastering his actual social context.—MISH

(195) **"The Multitudinous Orb: Some MILTONIC ELEMENTS IN SHELLEY"** by Ants Oras. *MLQ* 16(1955)247-57:—Important elements in the orb vision in Prometheus Unbound IV.236f come from M's poetic adaptation of Ezekiel in PL VI.749f, a passage which Shelley seems to have known by heart.—MISH

(196) **LYCIDAS.** M.C. Battestin "John Crowe Ransom & Lycidas: A Reappraisal" *CE* 17(1955-6)223-8:—Despite widespread acceptance, R's essay "A Poem Nearly Anonymous" (*AmerRev* 1933) contributes nothing of value to an understanding of Lycidas, largely because his approach depends on intuition rather than sound historical inferences. The view that L is the meretricious recreation of a crafty artist is, happily, without foundation.—MISH

(197) **"MILTON WITHOUT THE EPIC"** TLS 2792(Sep2.55) 529:—Questions the validity of the epithet "Miltonic" as applied to M's poetry generally. Critics need to take more account of M the occasional poet, the craftsman who suited style to needs of the moment. Comments briefly on Vol. II of Darbishire's ed. of The Poetical Works.—BRYANT

(198) **PR.** Edw. Cleveland "On the Identity Motive in PR" *MLQ* 16(1955)232-6:—Two further arguments to strengthen Eliz. Pope's hypothesis that an important motive in the action of the poem is Satan's attempt to discover Christ's real identity. 1: Christ's use of Old Testament wisdom & example suggests that for some reason he is acting as a man rather than a divine being. 2: When Satan finally resorts to violence, Christ asserts his divinity & defeats utterly S's purpose.—MISH

(199) **MILTON & POPE.** Aubrey L. Williams, Pope's DUNCIAD, A Study of its Meaning. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, \$3, 172p:—This, the first full-length critical study of the Dunciad, merits a review here for two main reasons: "With the exception of the Aeneid, no poem 'enters' into Pope's world of duncery more than Paradise Lost"; moreover the history of critical response to the two poems shows interesting parallels. Dr. Williams deals explicitly with the first point; the second becomes clear if one substitutes "PL" for "Dunciad" in his account of criticisms of it. Critics have been all too willing in both cases to refer the poems back to their authors' personalities, lives & alleged intentions & to read the poems as expressions, largely malignant, of those personalities. Both are, of course, expression of personalities: therein lies a strength of PL for those who admire Milton, but a weakness for those who dislike him or some stereotype of him which encumbers their minds; & therein lies a weakness of the Dunciad for most readers, admirers of Pope's personality being few. But PL rises to the contemplation of larger issues which have always been the preoccupation of mankind, & therein lies its permanent strength; & Williams' well argued thesis is that the Dunciad likewise rises to the contemplation of those larger issues. One might almost say that the pettiness is not in Pope but in the readers who are blind to the poem's shifts from the temporary to the universal & the timeless.

Pope's use of PL is a key to that larger meaning: from his parodying of Milton results "a tacit suggestion that the Dunciad like PL, is about a war between good & evil." In a new context, Milton's devils prosper so well as dunces that they carry to a conclusion the work of destruction introduced by Satan: Pope's England seemed to him to stand on the brink of cultural & moral disaster. He attacked that threat in the guise of duncery & oriented

the duncery in his selection of most of his Miltonic materials from satanic contexts, "a principle of selection which seems to have gone unnoticed by those critics & editors who . . . recognized one or another isolated instance of Pope's parodying." The theme of the Dunciad is in one sense the fulfillment of Satan's vow to restore to Chaos all creation. "It is as if Satan & his minions, now under a comic mask, are finally able to return to Dulness" her dominion over the universe." Thus "Milton & Pope are both attempting to dramatize the nature of evil." Both poets invert Christian themes and situations in an attempt to realize imaginatively the negativism of evil. In short, Williams has written not merely a major contribution to Pope studies but has revealed the extent & nature of one of the most significant examples of Miltonic literary influence.

(200) **17C WRITERS & WORDSWORTH.** Abbie Findlay Potts, Wordsworth's Prelude. A Study of its Literary Form. Cornell University Press, 1953, 406p, \$6:—To be a good Romantics scholar, one must know Milton & other 17C authors. Dr. Potts is such a scholar; moreover, instead of making another of those attempts to manufacture Wordsworth into a philosopher, she has the good sense to treat him as a poet—a poet who was primarily in the tradition not of Boehmenist mysticism or Germanic transcendentalism but of English literature, particularly the tradition of Milton & Bunyan. She sees the Prelude not as a philosophical tract but as literature, as the poetic account of the experience of youth and early manhood; & she sees that experience as permeated & quickened by Wordsworth's reading. She turns to the various drafts of the Prelude & finds that he crossed out or modified passages which seemed like echoes of other works: in other words, he was conscious that the grand total of his experience involved such works as Paradise Lost & Pilgrim's Progress. She then uses such works as analogues & keys to an understanding of the form & significance of the Prelude. She finds that its episodes correspond to those in Pilgrim's Progress—but not only to those in that poem but also to action pattern in Paradise Lost—and in Paradise Regained—and to basic elements in Habington's poetry (not to mention poets of other centuries)—until one gets the impression that all he knew & needed to know came to Wordsworth not from impulses from vernal woods but from the printed word. One is also tempted to cry, "This is too much!" & to begin to pick flaws, to decide that analogues should not be thus magnified into influence & indebtedness, to feel that Dr. Potts is far too ready to discover verbal echoes of Milton in Wordsworth's verse when, in fact, both were using stock terms; & one becomes annoyed by glibly assumed parallels (The Farmer of Tilsbury may be called Wordsworth's Paradise Lost, its Eve being the devouring 'poor'; "Again, the account of the Poet & 'Emma' passing . . . to Grasmere . . . is the Wordsworthian analogue of the Miltonic expulsion of Adam & Eve from Paradise"; "Milton's Abdiel reappears in the person of Wordsworth's Louvet"; Wordsworth "reconceived . . . Milton's Adam & Eve, prime man & woman, as the Poet & his 'Emma.' In MS B they are not yet explicitly represented as brother & sister; but he will be at some pains to avoid the conjugal pattern within which Milton's theology had been awkwardly confined"!!!

Some of this seems wild conjecture; we have no doubt that Dr. Potts overstates her case. We are equally sure that she could find patterns & phrases in Traherne, who was unknown to Wordsworth, which would throw quite as much light on the Prelude's form & meaning as the analogues which she discovers in works which Wordsworth read. As far as indebtedness & influence go, we are little convinced by the book—though not so rash as to deny that there was powerful influence from Milton & other 17C writers. Nevertheless the volume is a major contribution to scholarly method: for it seems to us that Dr. Potts conclusively demonstrates that great works of literature, if compared carefully, throw brilliant light on each other's meaning & structure; that they are often keys to each other; that the great themes of literature involve so much in common that the detection of parallel developments in them is a means of illuminating them far more clearly & profoundly than is possible with any other method. In other words, great literature properly used is the best critical commentary on other great literature. Whether Milton influenced Wordsworth or Wordsworth Milton seems of little importance compared to the fact that Dr. Potts' method enables depths of meaning to be discovered in Paradise Lost when it is seen in the light of the Prelude. In short, the miracle of her method is that it works both ways: while she was using Milton's poem as a key to Wordsworth's experience in the Prelude, she was, perhaps unknowingly, also furnishing her readers with the Prelude as a key to Paradise Lost.

(One further & minor comment. Dr. Potts makes excellent use of PL & PR in connection with the Prelude but neglects to use



Comus even though she quotes (in connection with PL) a passage which clearly echoes the end of Comus:

Truth justifies herself, and as she dwells

With Hope, who would not follow where she leads?)

(201) *ANALOGUES OF PL & PR*: R. A. Sayce, *THE FRENCH BIBLICAL EPIC IN THE 17TH CENTURY*. N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 284p.—Though mentioning Milton only in passing, this scholarly work is of prime significance for Miltonic studies: it treats comprehensively & lucidly the poetic tradition to which PL & PR belong, deals with many analogues of them, analyzes the aims, methods & problems faced by writers of Biblical epics, shows the relations of such works to religious & artistic beliefs, & perceptively discusses the critical theories connected with the tradition & the form. There are three main sections—The Background, The Poems, & The genre—& within them an amazing variety of chapters ranging from the origins of the form, the Baroque Poets, the Carmelites & Elijah, to the Merveilleux, the Heroic Style, and the Epic & the Visual Arts. The Introduction & Conclusion alone make the volume essential for any Miltonist.

The TLS reviewer erred when he found the book somewhat boring. Admittedly the middle section is tedious if read continuously, for it consists of separate synopses & accounts of a long succession of Biblical epics by Bernouin, Morillon, Coras & a host of other minor, little known poets. But this section is obviously intended for reference. The rest of the book is quick with scholarly stimulus & seminal force. Much is to be learned by scholars from the fresh approaches made by Sayce to biblical epics—approaches which, translated to Milton, would be fruitful & illuminating. No scholarship is more to be prized than that which, like this, is intrinsically interesting & significant & is also conducive in example & method to the writing of further interesting & significant studies.

Sayce examines 30 poems, one of them the highly poetic *Moyse sauvé* by Saint-Amant; others, like Perrault's *Adam*, estimable but not great works; some, like the *Eliade* of Pierre de Saint-Louis, interesting for grotesque originality; the majority, mediocre or worse. The author seeks not to rehabilitate these poets but to discover through the Biblical epic the 17C attitude to relationships between religion, literature & art.

Sayce discovers that the Biblical epic was chiefly a product of provinces where the Bible was much studied by Protestants or Romanists influenced by their example. The subject matter tended to be restricted to a few figures such as Susanna & Judith (favored by feminists), Joseph, & especially, David. Suitability for epic treatment was not the principal criterion; but analysis shows that subjects were chosen more to please than to fulfill professed goals of religious edification. During the 17C, the form of the biblical epics evolved from baroque extravagance to reason & harmony. But in general, the French writers failed. Why? Because of the discord between the Bible & the modern spirit which interprets it. As a result, the poems are built on unresolved conflicts—conflicts which explain the structural disharmonies, violent distortions of reality, & puerile disproportions between means & ends in the treatment of the supernatural. French classicism in such works as *Athalie* & *Esther* mastered these dissensions & resolved the discords, thus succeeding where the Biblical epics failed.

This stimulating able study contains a lengthy bibliography & eight plates illustrative of the discussions.

#### SECTION IV: DRYDEN AND DONNE

(202) *DRYDEN & THE ART OF TRANSLATION* by WILLIAM FROST. Yale University Press 1955, 100p, \$3.50. Review by LILLIAN FEDER, *Queens College*:—Mr. Frost calls his book *Dryden & the Art of Translation* "to indicate that he has . . . a double subject." He does not attempt a comprehensive study of Dryden's translations. Instead, he has made a brilliant contribution to the study of translation as an art & has suggested a new method of approaching & evaluating Dryden's translations.

The most rewarding chapter is the one on theory of translation. Here Frost, having made his concession to "the theoretical impossibility of translation," shows that a successful poetic translation will be both a poem in itself & an interpretation of the original work. In illustrating the difficulty of imitating or duplicating stylistic & rhythmic effects, & indicating the wide divergence among translations of the same work, he is not concerned with proving that translation is impossible, but with showing how it can stimulate & express the individual talent of the translator. "If a verse translation is a commentary on the original poem from which it derives, it is clear, however, that it is a different kind of commentary from that which would be written by an editor, a

scholar, or a critic. In brief, it interprets by enactment, not by analysis." A translator should not be expected to "reproduce" a poem in another language, but to construct his own version of it.

Frost's most interesting point in this chapter deals with the problem of symbolism. The ideal translator of a poem, he says, will cope successfully with "pillar symbols" and "local symbols." For "pillar symbols" he must "construct fairly convincing analogies," whereas he may create his own "local symbols." The development & illustration of this point, here & in later chapters, are the major contribution of this book.

The only objection to Frost's discussion of theory is a minor one. In refuting Matthew Arnold's argument that "Pope composes with his eye on his style, into which he translates his object, whatever it is," Mr. Frost seems deliberately to be misinterpreting Arnold: "The truth is that Homer could no more help composing with his eye on his style than Pope, Chaucer, Shakespeare, or any other true poet; if he had taken his eye off it, the result would not have been poetry." Surely Arnold's brilliant lectures *On Translating Homer* offer sufficient evidence that he is aware of the fact that style makes a poet. The sentence that Mr. Frost quotes about Pope simply illustrates Arnold's rather dramatic way of criticizing the obvious "artificiality" of Pope's style as contrasted with the "plainness" & "directness" which he considered characteristic of Homer's. That we today are more sympathetic to Pope's "artificiality" & can perhaps enjoy the very quality to which Arnold objected is no reason to twist a shrewd criticism into a rather silly statement which would require one to believe that Arnold did not know that a poet must be concerned with style. However, this is a minor flaw in a brilliant chapter & should not be over-emphasized.

The two chapters which deal with Dryden as translator are excellent as far as they go, but one can only hope that Frost will go on to a fuller treatment of his subject. Some of his remarks on Dryden's methods are particularly shrewd & need no further development, but occasionally one feels that, though Frost does not attempt a comprehensive treatment of his subject, he is obliged to develop certain points more fully even in so brief an analysis. For example, in discussing Dryden's translation of the well known "Sunt lacrimae rerum . . ." passage in the *Aeneid*, Frost seems to take for granted that R.H. Martin's "Note on Dryden's *Aeneid*" provides the accepted modern interpretation of the lines. However, this is but one of many current views on the meaning of the passage. Since Frost's remarks on Dryden's version of the passage depend on Martin's interpretation, he is obliged to show why it is more acceptable than others equally popular.

Actually Frost seems to be best when he is not dependent on the scholarship of others. His critical comments on the poetry of Chaucer, Homer, & Vergil which Dryden translated are excellent. He is often able in a sentence or a paragraph to offer a new and stimulating view of the original work & to reveal an unusual understanding of the relationship of the translation to it. Also, he makes a fine defense of Dryden's ability to use conventional language & periphrases with skill and originality, & shows a deep appreciation of the way in which Dryden's translations reflect the "living relationship" of Latin to English in his time.

Mr. Frost's style is lucid and graceful, & transmits to the reader the author's enthusiasm for his subject. His book is an exciting one and, though he has been able to say a great deal in a little space, one hopes that he will go on to develop more fully some of the ideas which this book contains.

(203) "HISTORICAL ALLUSIONS IN ABSOLOM & ACHITOPHEL" by James Kinsley. RES 6(1955)291-7:—Notes supplementary to de Beers' article in RES 17(1941). Ammon is Sir John Coventry; Balaam & Caleb are Theophilus Hastings & (perhaps) Arthur Capel, Earl of Essex; Agag is Lord Stafford; Isaacar is Thomas Thynne of Longleat.—MISH

(204) "INTENTION & ACHIEVEMENT IN ALL FOR LOVE" by E.H. Emerson, H.E. Davis & I. Johnson. CE 17(1955-6)84-7:—Dr. Johnson's criticism that the play holds up for admiration conduct which good men must always censure as vicious, points out an important confusion between D's intention & achievement.—MISH

(205) "DONNE AT ST. DUNSTON'S" by B.W. Whitlock. TLS 2,794(16Sep55)548; 2,795(23Sep55)564:—Study of references to Donne as Vicar of St. Dunstan's-in-the-West which appear in the church records, now at Guildhall Library. All the entries which concern D's activities at the church are included.—BRYANT

(206) "DONNE'S BOOKS IN THE MIDDLE TEMPLE" by John Sparrow. TLS 2,787(29Jul55)435; 2,788(5Aug55)451:—Dis-

covery of 61 volumes at Middle Temple Library which once belonged to D; record of 9 more probably destroyed in War II. The 61 vols. contain 69 works. The high proportion of religious works parallels proportion in Keynes' list. Publication dates confirm the impression that D bought few books after ordination in 1615. A copy of Nicholas Hill's *Philosophica Epicurea* 1601 seems to have belonged to both Jonson & Donne.—BRYANT

(207) "DONNE IN THE PULPIT TLS 2,793(9Sep55)529:—D's sermons preached during the time when he was Divinity Reader at Lincoln's Inn (now appearing in Potter & Simpson's ed, vol. II) show D's concept of his calling as prophet rather than priest, with sin & repentance the central theme. These works show the first stages of his method of sermon construction.—BRYANT

(208) DONNE'S CHARACTER. B.W. Whitlock, "Ye Curious Schooler in Christendom" RES 6(1955)365-71:—Offers correct text of Edward Alleyn's letter to D of Jan. 1624/5, which paints a somewhat dark picture of D's character.—MISH

#### SECTION V: MINOR POETS; TEXTBOOKS OF POETRY

(209) GEORGE SANDYS, POET-ADVENTURER by Richard Beale Davis. Columbia University Press 1955. 320p. \$4.75. Review by GEORGE B. PARKS, *Queens College*:—This is the first full-length biography of the traveler & translator of Ovid & the Psalms, & it adds notably to our factual knowledge of his life (1578-1644). The youngest of nine children of Elizabeth's Archbishop of York is here presented as a characteristic "man of the renaissance" in that he engaged both in letters & in action. We must, however, note that his life of action was effective only in his four years in Virginia (1621-25), where he was treasurer during the short dominance of the Virginia Company by his elder brother Sir Edwin. Professor Davis has assembled the documents which show his busy official and farming activities there, reporting his supervision of the glassmaking, ironworking, and other infant industries, & recording in vigorous prose the trials of the colonists. In the light of these documents, the biographer urged the retrial of the charges brought against the Edwin Sandys faction which led to the "nationalizing" of the colony in 1624.

Returned to England, Sandys remained a quasi-official of the colonial administration & a colonial agent; it is not clear that this activity can class him as a man of action, however energetic his pen was in drafting memorials. His main career remains that of a gentleman writer, though one slow to develop. Mr. Davis' first discovery about his life is that he actually married Elizabeth Norton of Ripon as his father had intended for property's sake, but also that he surprisingly left her in 1606 after ten years of married life among the squirearchy; the evidence is in a spate of documents from lawsuits, which show that the wife got the property back but lost the husband, why we do not know. We do not know either why Sandys traveled to the Levant four years after he left his wife, when he was 32 & well past the age when young men of family pursued their education abroad. Until then there is no evidence of his intellectual interests (entrance to Oxford or the Middle Temple is hardly such evidence); thereafter the *Travels* which he wrote and published (1615) after his return reveal much reading in classical authors & in current writers on history & travel. We do not know why he next turned poet—Davis may be right in thinking that the numerous Latin verses which he translated to adorn the *Travels* established the habit—or why he translated the particular works he chose: the *Metamorphoses*, the *Psalms* and *Job*, the first book of *Aeneid*, & the *Christus Patiens* of Grotius. It is pleasant to think of the other educated persons in Virginia with him whom the biographer lists, & to count him later in the devoted Falkland circle of poets and scholars.

Davis has brought out all the material and studied the writings, & done heroic service in setting straight their bibliography. I venture to add some suggestions. There should be some significance in Sandys' following the example of his brother Edwin, who had done before him a travel book & a version of the *Psalms*; these works are mentioned here, but not examined. Again, I should like to note two startling innovations in style in George Sandys' *Travels*. One is the sprinkling of the pages with Latin verse quotations which are then translated into English, so establishing in England the tradition of the literary traveler. The other is Sandys' use of the new Senecan style of succinct expression, which Professor Williamson mistakenly, I think, assigns to Edwin rather than to George Sandys (*The Senecan Ambler*, p. 89). In both these respects the *Travels* now seems to me to have much more originality than when I once discussed it with Davis.

With regard to Sandys as poet, the biographer surveys the opinions expressed since Drayton of his metrical skill, & con-

cludes that a full-length restudy is necessary of Sandys' place in the history of the couplet. I am sorry that he did not pass his own judgment on Sandys as poet. He does, it is true, grant Sandys "Elizabethan exuberance" (p. 222), & guardedly says that Sandys is, "contrasted with more recent translators, a creative 'poet.'" This is faint praise. Does the biographer agree with Dryden's first judgment, that Sandys found Ovid verse & left him prose? or with his second, that Sandys was the best versifier of the former age? Certainly the Ovid is wordy: is it worthily so? or is it, like the Biblical paraphrases, flat & lacking in salt? My own samplings do not assay very high, but they are not authoritative, and we expect authoritative literary judgments from the poet's biographer. Else why bother to write the life of a poet?

(210) CRASHAW. Robert M. Adams "Taste & Bad Taste in Metaphysical Poetry: Richard Crashaw & Dylan Thomas" HUDSON REV 8(1955)61-77:—Metaphysical subject-matter involves a decorum different from that of other poetry; its taste is, correspondingly, not "bad" but different.—MISH

(211) "LOVELACE'S 'THE GRASSHOPPER'" S.E. Ren. paper by Don Cameron Allen:—From the Greeks to the 17C the grasshopper variously symbolized gay summer months, aristocracy, the poet, the gift of prophecy, immortality, the man who lost out, & the fallen aristocrat. Since most of these connotations are implicit in L's lyric, it becomes something of an elegy & also a consolation for the fallen "grasshopper King," Charles I & the defeated aristocracy.

(212) STRODE. C.F. Main "Notes on Some Poems Attributed to William Strode" PQ 34(1955)444-8:—Notes on the various anthology appearances of S's 4 best known poems; doubts the authenticity of 6 more.—MISH

(213) VAUGHAN. Ross Garner, *The Intellectual Background of Henry Vaughan's Religious Poetry* (Report on U. of Chicago dissertation):—Hermeticism has a relatively minor place in V's poetry; explanation of his poetry & experience by notions derived from occult texts garble or confuse. His response to experience may best be elucidated by reference to the Bible, standard commentaries, theological treatises accepted by Anglicanism. "Regeneration" derives from Christian influences—spiritual autobiography, emblem books, & allegorical method; the Hermetic element, imported to explain the poem, obfuscates it; its pessimism is Christian, not Hermetic. The Hermetic element is used in "Resurrection & Immortality," but only for the sake of analogy: provision for things in the order of nature is like the provision for things in the order of grace. To read in the Hermetic notion of the World Soul is to destroy the structure on which the poem is based. A charge of animism has been made because of a supposed likeness between a passage in the *Corpus Hermeticum* & Vaughan's meditative poem on "Rom. Cap. 8. ver. 19," but analysis shows that the poem is rather Biblical than Thomist or Hermetic; Hermeticism often found refuge in monistic materialism, but Vaughan retains the distinction of material substance & immaterial substance. The 4 ways in which he sees the manifestation of God in nature are Christian. Vaughan sees the creatures as participating in the being of God by an instinctive obedience to their principles of existence—an obedience which puts man to shame when his rebellious will excludes him from their blessings. Vaughan sees moral & religious lessons in natural objects; he sees God turning evil to good & providing for His creatures in a way that shadows in the order of Nature His care of the creatures in the order of Grace. Vaughan absorbs a measure of grace himself by an imaginative identification with the things of nature, finding in an adoption of their being the participation in the being of God which they have instinctively.

"The Night" has been misread as Hermetic. If V's poetry of immanence was not Hermetic, his poetry of transcendence can hardly be so, for the dualistic basis of Hermetic mysticism sees God as transcendent only; for V as for all Christian mystics, God's immanence implies His transcendence. In "The Night," V finds in Christian doctrine the identifying link between the immanent & transcendent God. Christ is mediator in several ways; as mediator between the creation & her Creator, He leads V through the contemplation of Himself in the creatures toward the direct vision of Him. V's religious experience is mystical, but not in the sense that it is the ultimate step of the way of perfection; it is a Pisgah sight of that step & a longing for it. V's spiritual autobiography traces the three steps of the mystical way, but his particular quality is longing for God rather than possession of Him. The poet is a product of his times in his partisanship & in his Augustinian distrust of human nature, but he is universal in his religious experience.



Vaughan's verse is devotional & springs from a habit of mind which sees the material universe not only as a small part of the whole but as an allegory of the immaterial universe, the world of Platonic forms. For him, allegory is not only fiction but revelation of mystery, adumbration of reality beneath experience. His experience of that reality—eternity as light or rings, the world as exile from lost innocence—depends for its expression on the standard literature of Western Christian thought as it was filtered through a delicate sense of God in nature & beyond it. Hermeticism is used as analogy in Vaughan, & as metaphor. For him, immanence & transcendence depend on each other; in Hermeticism, God is either immanent or transcendent, not both. The experience which he recreated in poetry derives from St. Paul, the Alexandrians, Augustine, pseudo-Dionysius, Aquinas, & standard Christian theologians, & his own acute religious & poetic sensibility.

(214) *ELEMENTS OF POETRY* by James R. Kreuzer. N.Y.: Macmillan, 1955, \$2.90:—A marvellously lucid, royal road to the essentials of poetry & how to analyze & explicate it; points are often illuminated by 17C examples. Noteworthy are the treatments of WALLER, "Go, Lovely Rose" (p156) & VAUGHAN, "Retreat" (p159).

(215) *SIXTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLISH POETRY*, ed. Norman E. McClure, \$6, 636p; *SIXTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLISH PROSE*, ed. Karl J. Holzknecht, \$6, 636p. N.Y.: Harper & Bros. (Harper English Literature Series) 1954:—If one may judge by these two textbook anthologies, the 16th century, strictly speaking, was chiefly an age of prose, for the bulk of the Holzknecht selections are from works written & published before 1600 and by authors who died before that date. But, at a rough estimate, at least half of the poetry in the McClure volume was composed or first published after 1600 by writers whose lives extended 1, 2, or even 3 decades into the 17C. There were only four years between the death of Richard Barnfield & the birth of Dryden; indeed, Dryden was 25 when Joseph Hall died—though we hasten to add that the latter's *Virgidemiarum* 1597 has every claim to its representation in the volume of poetry. Nevertheless, it is well to be on guard against the chronological warping whereby 18C scholars tend to steal writers of the last half of the 17C (though pushing Milton out of his rightful niche in the Restoration period) and 16C scholars encroach on the first quarter of the 17C. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that, although older anthologies tended to claim Donne for the Elizabethans, McClure unhesitatingly leaves him for the 17C anthology which is being prepared for this series. The result is that Donne's pioneer satires are excluded from the chronological position they might claim along with those Lodge & Hall.

These comments are not made as objections: lines must be drawn & the editors are wise to be guided by form, content, & flavor rather than by mere chronology. Both have chosen well & have provided generous selections without modernization of spelling. Introductions & footnotes point to sound scholarly & critical works on the authors & genres represented, provide essential information, & in doing so reveal that the editors' skill in selection of texts extends also to a mastery of the art of clear, essential annotation.

## SECTION VI: FICTION

(216) "LOVE LETTERS BETWEEN POLYDORUS . . . & MESSALINA" by ROBERT A. DAY (*Queens College*); the third of a series on 17C fiction specially written for the NEWS. (See the articles by Charles C. Mish on Reynolds & Anton in vol.X, p37 & vol.XI, pp.24-5).

Those who regard the *chronique scandaleuse* & the novel in letters as peculiarly 18C developments in England will be interested to know that such works were ably anticipated in the later 17C, notably in *Love Letters between Polydorus, the Gothick King, and Messalina, Late Queen of Albion*. This work, hitherto neglected by literary historians, was published in 1689 by Wm. Lyford, with the imprint "Paris." It is notable on two counts: it pretends to reveal the secret, treasonous, & amorous correspondence of Mary of Modena with Louis XIV; & it shows an appreciation of the technical potentialities of the epistolary method that is astonishing at such an early date.

It appeared at a time when the public was ready to devour scandalous allegations about its recently-deposed rulers, & the cautious printer presumably fooled nobody with his Paris imprint, though he made a formal gesture toward averting trouble in the event of future difficulties. The way had been prepared by a recent sensational novel, *The Amours of Messalina* (mentioned in the preface of *Love Letters*), & the bookseller could be sure that a

profitable segment of the reading public had identified the name with James II's queen.

Although Wing's short-title catalogue ascribes the work to Aphra Behn (No. B1743), her authorship is very doubtful. Mrs. Behn's works as a whole reveal her as a staunch Tory in her sympathies, & the novel describes the flight of the Queen from England, which took place on December 10, 1688, while Mrs. Behn died on April 19, 1689, after a prolonged illness, & was probably incapable of much work during the last months of her life. The book is more probably an imitation of her manner.

The characters are easily identifiable behind the absurd names imposed by contemporary custom and by caution. Polydorus is Louis XIV, Messalina is Mary of Modena; James becomes Lycogenes, while William of Orange is Anaximander, the Jesuit Petre Father Pedro, & Tyrconnel Latroon. The "novel" is a short one in twelve letters, dealing with Messalina's intrigues to establish the "Gothick heresy" in Albion, the defeat of Lycogenes, & Messalina's flight to the protection and later the arms of Polydorus.

Realism is provided by a fiction in the preface—the letters were intercepted by "some of no mean intelligence" while in the custody of "a near Confident of Messalina's, [who] not only gain'd them a sight of the Originals of these following Letters, but time also to transcribe them, she being it seems the only agent for their safe delivery"—& also by the device of having the seventh letter break off suddenly at a crucial point with the notation "Imperfect in the Original."

In spite of its ridiculous background of state scandal the story is managed with considerable skill; the letters devote much space to the amorous disquisitions and agonies of Messalina. They are supposed to be written while the events they describe are taking place. Most are in a vein of extravagant rhetoric, the brief postscripts conveying the necessary information. The story has several ramifications; characters often say one thing & mean another. The exchange of letters is divided among the personages. Messalina & Polydorus correspond; Messalina writes Aspasia (Tyrconnel's wife) concerning affairs in Iberia (Ireland) & is answered; Father Pedro writes Polydorus a letter in plain prose, telling him how far the rebellion has progressed & what steps are now unsafe for him to take. Messalina escapes from Albion & reaches "the Gothick realm," whereupon Polydorus begins to besiege her virtue, Lycogenes being absent in Iberia. The author is careful to make it plain that Polydorus is merely using the royal pair for his own purposes by the extravagance of his letters & the elaborate sophistries with which he answers Messalina's complaints. In his first letter he asks if he shall offer rescue, but does not do so; in Letter VII he welcomes her to France but says nothing about the promised troops; later, when she demands to know if he intends to keep his promise to prevent rebellion in Ireland, he answers with a flurry of rhetoric about "cruel nymphs" and concludes: "P. S. My lovely Queen, thou canst not be insensible how the urgency of my own affairs . . . have put some restraint on my resolutions to have equipped [Polydorus]." At the end of the correspondence the reader is left to surmise that Messalina's virtue will not resist Polydorus much longer.

While the story is greatly inferior to many contemporary tales, such as those of Mrs. Behn, it shows an unusual degree of skill in the management of the epistolary material. The reader is shown the dream world where Messalina exists within a web spun around her by Polydorus' glittering promises, a world contrasted with the undercurrent of unsavory realities. The contrast is made more forcible by the opposition of flowery & artificial diction to the plain & forcible prose in which the facts are presented. (The passionate or elevated passages are nearly all written in concealed blank verse.) Bad as the novel is, it represents technical advances which could have produced a distinguished result if better applied to better material.

(217) "SEA-IMAGERY & GREEN'S CARDE OF FANCIE," S.E. Ren. paper by G.W. Hallam:—The plan of G's romance was to reveal & criticize the follies of youth & love through sea-images centered around the ship of youth on the storm-tossed sea of the world, the card of fancy being the guide or chart of Cupid, who guides the youth adventurers into a variety of disasters.

(218) *SELECTED WRITINGS OF THE INGENIOUS APHRA BEHN*, ed. Robert Phelps. N.Y.: Grove Press, 244p, \$1.45 paper (Evergreen Bks, repr. from the original ed. 1950):—"The present selection is hardly for the scholar, rather for that hearty we call the General Reader": so writes the editor—correctly so; for he is somewhat too ready to accept Montague Summers' texts as reliable & shows no awareness of scholarship on Behn since 1940, & he makes the absurd statement that authors before Dryden "regarded themselves & their work as one, or rather, they had not yet reached a point at which they were conscious of the two as disjunct." Has he never heard of Lyly? Does he not know that Elizabethans could be so disjunct that Sidney had to remind himself & them to look into themselves & write?

It would have been simple to produce a volume attractive to general readers & yet satisfying the need of students for a good sampling of Behn's works other than the readily available *Oroonoko*. Some restraint about generalizations, an up-to-date bibliography, & perhaps less concern to choose texts for their "vitality" (the editor's word for sexy content?) would have resulted in a book useful for the scholar and still generally attractive. Even as it stands, the collection is of considerable interest to both groups: it comprises four narratives, loosely called "novels"—*The Adventure of the Black Lady*, which reveals Behn's verve & skill delightfully, *The Court of the King of Bantam*, which does not, *The Unfortunate Happy Lady*, & *The Fair Jilt*. Behn's comedy, *The Fair Jilt*, was a good choice. A representative selection of mediocre, competent, & smutty verse completes the volume.

(219) Robert A. Day, "Bibliography of Epistolary Fiction, 1660-1740." In his edition of Mary Davys. *FAMILIAR LETTERS BETWEEN A GENTLEMAN & A LADY*, 1725. Los Angeles 1955 (Augustan Reprint Soc. Pub. no 54), 60c. Review by CHARLES C. MISH, Maryland:—For the period 1660-1700, the bibliography lists chronologically 63 titles, at least half of which I did not enter in my own chronological checklist of 17C fiction. Dr. Day casts a wide net & hauls in everything he can which contains letters; one is surprised to find in his list such familiar items as Boyle's *PARTHENISSA* & Bulteel's *BIRINTHEA*, which certainly contain incidental letters even if one does not think of them as epistolary fiction. But if these heroic romances are to be listed, why not others of the genre which also contain letters, e.g. *CLELIA*? Might it not have been better to restrict the bibliography to those works which were entirely or predominantly epistolary?

#### SECTION VII: BIBLIOGRAPHY.

(220) Volume VIII of *STUDIES IN BIBLIOGRAPHY, PAPERS OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA* (Charlottesville: the Society, 1956, 276p, \$6), ed. Fredson Bowers:—This volume is not as rich as previous ones in non-Shakespearean 17C items, despite variety from Skelton to De La Mare. However, the methods employed in the papers on Shakespeare should prove translatable to 17C publications: indeed, one learns to look to Shakespearean bibliographers for advances applicable to other authors. In this connection Philip Williams' "New Approaches to Textual Problems in Shakespeare" is particularly helpful: he advocates more careful study of particular compositors & greater cooperation in editing. Alice Walker demonstrates how compositor analysis contributes toward the solution of editorial problems, particularly of textual corruption.

John Russell Brown provides a second article on the printing of JOHN WEBSTER's plays & lists all the press-variants in *The White Devil*, *The Duchess*, & *The Devil's Law Case*: Webster seems to have visited the press in the case of at least the last two of these. Of particular value to future editors of *The Duchess* is the new knowledge about its compositors; e.g., the copy, not they, must be blamed for the paucity of stage directions.

Cyrus Hoy deals with the share of Fletcher & his collaborators in the Beaumont & Fletcher canon, discovering, *inter alia*, that the linguistic patterns of Massinger & Fletcher are as nearly opposite as they could be. R.L. Haig adds to the history of the King's Printing Office 1680-1730. John L. Lievsay adds greatly to what is known about William Barley; from 1606 to 1613 all English music books were printed by him or his assignees, but it is less well known that he published widely in other fields—cookbooks, jest-books, prose fiction, pamphlets, etc.

The check list of Bibliographical Scholarship for 1954 lists many items on 17C topics which we have mentioned in these columns as well as others which we have overlooked; e.g. D. W. Davies, *The World of the ELSEVIERS*, 1580-1712, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1954.

(221) *PRINTER*. Leona Rostenberg, "Nathaniel Thompson, Catholic Printer & Publisher of the Restoration" LIBRARY Sept. 1955:—Despite an expedient public disavowal of his faith, there is adequate indication that Thompson was a Roman Catholic who published books & wrote a news-sheet *THE DOMESTIC INTELLIGENCER* to champion & bolster his religious cause. His resolute, courageous perseverance as a Romanist printer & publisher indicates a sizable clientele of his faith in Restoration England.

(222) *17TH-CENTURY BIOGRAPHIES*, by V. de S. Pinto (National Book League Reader's Guides, S2, no5). N.Y.: Cambridge University Press, 1955, 32p, 50c paper:—A list of biographies about English writers of the 17C from Aubrey, Bacon, Baxter & Behn to Wren & Wycherley, with a 5p introduction—

useful to the average reader but strangely incomplete: e.g., for Sir Thomas Browne only Gosse's life is mentioned; Hyde, Bottrall & Hutchinson are listed for Herbert, but not Summers. Forneron's *Louise de Kéroualle* is listed but not Stearn's life of Hugh Peters. Preference is given to English publishers &, in general, to "popular" works like Buchan's *Cromwell* despite scholarly distrust in some of them.

(223) The Bodleian Library Record 5:4(Oct55) announces the publication of *BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PRINTED WORKS RELATING TO OXFORDSHIRE* (exclusive of the city & university), obtainable from the Bodleian Library for 42s. New purchases by the Library include an unfinished English translation of Henri Estienne entitled *ANE APOLOGIE FOR HERRODOTT* (MS.Don.e.54); a MS copy of *TRUE RELATION OF PARLIAMENT*, 17 Mar-26 June 1628, containing House of Commons debates (described in HMC 2nd Rpt, App. p5:14.)

(224) *INDEX OF PRINTERS, PUBLISHERS & BOOKSELLERS IN DONALD WING'S SHORT-TITLE CATALOGUE OF BOOKS PRINTED IN ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, IRELAND, WALES, & BRITISH AMERICA & OF ENGLISH BOOKS PRINTED IN OTHER COUNTRIES 1641-1700* by Paul G. Morrison. University of Virginia Press for The Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1955, 220p:—Wing's prodigious task deserves this careful complement; & its uses are manifold. For example, there is the problem whether Simmons, the printer of *Paradise Lost*, & his workers were responsible for spelling changes in that work. A solution might be possible if this index were used to ascertain what other books he printed (There are 23 entries under his name); then, if mss versions of some of those works are found, they could be compared with the printed texts in order to find out what changes, if any, were made in the spelling. Similarly by finding out what kinds of printing errors occurred in one product of a particular printer, one might be more confidently able to spot and amend similar errors in other works from his shop. But such uses are only possible ones. The main & obvious value of this index is for such areas as the history of publishing, author-printer relations, & the like. Inevitably the Index carries with it the faults of the original: as Morrison warns, he has not indexed a revised book that does not yet exist. But he has greatly added to the usefulness of a generally reliable major tool of scholarship.

(225) *CENSORSHIP* Leona Rostenberg "Robert Stephens, Messenger of the Press: An Episode in 17C Censorship" PAPERS BIB. SOC. AMER 49(1955)131-52:—Stephens assisted *L'Estrange* by seeking out seditious publications but later opposed him; his career shows the bigotry of censorship.

(226) "IS THIS A FACSIMILE WHICH I SEE BEFORE ME?" Fredson Bowers, "The Yale Folio Facsimile & Scholarship" MP 53(Au55)50-7:—Köckeritz claims a technical validity for the work appropriate to collotype but not line offset, the method used. Claims for the Folio are not honest; it is a mass-market production, lacking quality—in fact, the "second faultiest ever offered for sale." The technique, though free of 'retouching' in a technical sense, allowed 'opaquing,' equally as bad, in this case done by a technician rather than a scholar. Incredibly, the Facsimile was not checked back against the Elizabethan Club copy. Some errors have been admitted in the Errata, but there are scores of others, as a hurried collation with the original & the Lee facsimile shows. Scholars must rely on the Lee Facsimile (1902) or the Lionel Booth (1862-65) either of which may ordinarily be purchased for half the price of the Yale Folio. Moreover, Prouty's Introduction demonstrates astonishing disregard of recent scholarship. No attempt has been made to supply a line numbering system to replace that of the Globe edition, a missed opportunity. Why was the edition not held back until Charlton Hinman finished his collation of the 79 Folger Folios, a matter of perhaps a year or two? Conclusion: the edition is worthless for serious scholarship, especially textual, bibliographical, etc.—EVANS

#### SECTION IX: MISCELLANEOUS—RUBENS, HISTORY, ETC.

(227) *A HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES* by R. B. Nye & J. E. Morpungo. Pelican Books A313. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1955. 2 vols, 85c each, paper:—As we have learned to expect from the Penguin & Pelican series, these are bargain buys, authoritative, pleasant to read, &, in this case, useful also for the reference shelf. Vol. II covers from 1814 to the present, but we are con-



cerned here only with about 160 pages of vol. I—those devoted to the 17C. Since the 334 pages of vol. I contain about 90,000 words, the 17C content is far from negligible; it covers the foundation & developments of the various colonies not only in politics & religion but in culture, pleasures & necessities, etc.

The authors, one American, the other English, demolish nonsense with gusto & authority: "the Pilgrim Fathers were not dummies set up in an edifying Victorian waxworks. Hardly less than their Virginian contemporaries they danced to the tunes of Elizabethan Englishmen. . . . To them the humility of Uriah Heep & the humility of Saint Francis of Assisi were alike foreign. . . . Slapped on the cheek, they turned the other cheek to hide the fact that they were feeling for a cudgel. The world was theirs to enjoy. . . . The pleasures of ultimate salvation took precedence in their minds above all else, but not to the complete extinction of all else."

We also like the way in which the authors lighten the mass of essential factual material with human details: for example, the account of Judge Sewall's courting, using books instead of the chocolates & flowers of another age.

The chapter on Poets & Puritans admirably, though briefly, covers such writers as Edward Taylor, & sums up that he was a curiosity in New England literature; in contrast, "Anne Bradstreet, that other successful & lovable poet of Massachusetts, had readers."

A well selected bibliography serves as a guide to other books, though it is well to note that few, if any, titles published since 1953 are mentioned.

(228) *THE LETTERS OF PETER PAUL RUBENS*. Transl. & ed. by Ruth Saunders Magurn. Harvard University Press, 1955, 544p, \$10.—As a diplomat, Rubens deserves most of the credit for the Anglo-Spanish peace of 1630. In his roles as observer & participant in international politics he was a realist: "in public affairs I am the most dispassionate man in the world, except where my property & person are concerned." Hence one of the multiple interests of these 250 letters—all of his that survive—is their reflection of the complications & culture of the European ruling class in the years from 1603 to 1640. At one moment Rubens is concerned with how to make a perpetual motion machine; then he tells about a shoemaker "who, in fitting a new boot, almost crippled my foot," or comments on the "caprice & the arrogance of Buckingham," adding, "I pity the young king. . . . For anyone can start a war, . . . but he cannot so easily end it." Then he will amuse a correspondent with light social reporting; for example, "On Carnival Sunday many Lords of this Court [in Antwerp] staged a race. . . . The livery & costumes of the cavaliers were very handsome, but they ran disgracefully." Or Rubens will moralize: as for the penury of princes, "I cannot explain it otherwise than that the riches of the world are distributed in the hands of private individuals, & that this is the cause of public poverty. For a river, however great, will dry up if divided & drained into many streams." "Today the interests of the entire world are closely linked together, but the states are governed by men without experience & incapable of following the counsel of others." "It is evident that religion exerts a stronger influence upon the human mind than any other motive."

Rubens' diplomatic mission to England in 1629 inspired some of his most interesting passages. "This island," he writes, ". . . seems to me to be a spectacle worthy of the interest of every gentleman, not only for the beauty of the countryside & the charm of the nation; not only for the splendor of the outward culture, which seems to be extreme, as of a people rich & happy in the lap of peace, but also for the incredible quantity of excellent pictures, statues, & ancient inscriptions which are to be found in this court." Or again, "Certainly in this island I find none of the crudeness which one might expect from a place so remote from Italian elegance."

Specialists in painting are likely to be disappointed by the relative paucity of material on art in the letters, though they will find such matters as Rubens' description & interpretation of his "Horrors of War" (now in the Pitti Gallery) & a clear statement of how much he & how much his pupils painted in the pictures which bear his name.

The appeal of these letters (the first time collected in full, translated into English, & ably edited), is not for specialists in art or any other area but for anyone interested in the rich texture of cosmopolitan life, especially politics, in Europe in the Baroque period. But this does not mean that specialists may ignore the work—far from it. Neo-Latinists, for example, will delight to find how Rubens kept *au courant* in the Neo-Latin works of Selden, Rigault, Louis Nonnius, Jacob de Bie, Cardan, Grotius, etc. And Miltonists—at least those who know well Milton's career as Latin Secretary—will be interested not only to see that he had such a great precedent for turning from the arts to a public career, but

also to find mention in Rubens' letters of men who later became important for Milton's state papers—Walter Montagu, Sir William Boswell, Sir Francis Cottington; the Dutch ambassador, Albert Joachimi, etc.

(229) *DIGBY*. Vittorio Gabrieli, "La Missione di Sir Kenelm Digby alla Corte di Innocenzo X (1645-48)" *ENGLISH MISCELLANY* 55(1954)247-88.—The mission to gain papal help for Charles I is explored in greater detail than hitherto, with the help of mss in the Vatican Archives & of D's multitudinous private correspondence. No envoy could have gained effective aid for the King: certainly not one who in effect accused the Pope of intent to subvert the monarchy (p263) & who supported the secular clergy against the entrenched religious orders. The Pope was not impressed by D's offer to maintain the papacy against secular enemies with a British fleet (p264). Venice for its part politely refused the offer of such a fleet to destroy (for pay) the Turkish navy (p275-6). D's private annoyances & his many intellectual interests are reflected in the private letters, notably to the learned Dal Pozzo.—PARKS

(230) *RENAISSANCE PAPERS 1955*. A Selection of Papers Presented at the Renaissance Meeting in the Southeastern States. University of South Carolina April 22-23, 1955; ed. Allan H. Gilbert. Published jointly by the U. of S.C. & Duke Univ. Obtainable gratis by scholars & libraries as long as the supply lasts from the Managing Editor, Hennig Cohen, Univ. of S. C., Columbia, S. C.:—This delightfully illustrated volume opens with Allan H. Gilbert's account of how Rubens used classical coins in designs for triumphs, transforming severity to the lively movement of painting. Articles on Des Periers, *King Lear*, & *Much Ado* are beyond our province. On pp. 40-46, THOMAS WHEELER treats BACON'S CONCEPT OF THE HISTORIAN'S TASK:—In theory B. classified history as a branch of memory & advocated rigid objectivity, narration of facts without interpretation or criticism; in practice he wrote history in the spirit of the artist or philosopher, imaginatively recreating the past & critically evaluating it.

"MASSINGER's Imagery" (pp47-54) by JOHN O. LYONS:—Massinger used the organic image, sustained throughout a play, basic to its didactic & dramatic structure; e.g. imagery of food, court corruption, weapons & war, & clothes respectively in *THE DUKE OF MILAN*, *THE GREAT DUKE OF FLORENCE*, *A NEW WAY*, & *THE CITY MADAM*.

For details about two other articles, see *NEO-LATIN NEWS* (this issue), items 13 & 15.

(231) *WORKS ON 17C TOPICS BY DANIEL C. BOUGHNER*, Evansville College. (1) "Machiavelli's *Clizia* & Jonson's *Epicoene*" *PQ* 19(1939)89-91:—J. owed a greater debt to M. than to Arétino. M's *Nicomace*, a brilliant study of old age, prepares the way for J's *Morose*. (2) "Milton's *Harapha* & Renaissance Comedy" *JELH* 11(1944)297-306:—The giant has little in common with biblical story or Greek tragedy but recalls chivalric romances, Latin comedy, & especially Italian *comedia erudita*. *Harapha* may be woven out of the same comic stuff that Milton disparages in the preface to *SA*; if so, the part has a richer texture than is ordinarily seen in it. M infuses the traditional role of the classical blusterer with the newer spirit of mockery of chivalric pretensions & the duelling code. (3) *The Braggart in Renaissance Comedy*, U. of Minnesota Press, 1954:—Comments from reviewers: L. Bradner in *MLN* 70:205-6, ". . . in one single monograph we can follow developments in all the countries of Europe where there was any significant drama"; J. G. Fucilla in *RN* 7:101-2 says that Boughner proves that Italian Renaissance comedy is no servile imitation of classical models but shows originality in treatment of the braggart: "this might serve as a first step towards a revaluation of the entire comic theatre repertoire in Renaissance Italy."

Dr. Boughner has also published extensively on 16C literature & Shakespeare. He is at present preparing a book on *Ben Jonson & the Italian Renaissance*; one of its main chapters will treat Jonson & Machiavelli.

(232) *17C PERIODICALS ON MICROFILM*. *The Periodical Postboy*, a news letter issued "every semi-so-often" & distributed gratis by Powell Stewart, M.B.2305, Univ. of Texas, made one of its exceedingly rare but welcome appearances in June 1955 & included an account of the project whereby, since 1951, University Microfilms Inc., of Ann Arbor, have been microfilming literary periodicals of the 17, 18, & 19th centuries for subscribers. As of May 1955 the following 17C periodicals (as well as many others) had been issued to subscribers: *ATHENIAN GAZETTE* 1691-7;

COMPLEAT LIBRARY 1692-4; HISTORY OF LEARNING 1691-2, 1694; HISTORY OF THE WORKS OF THE LEARNED 1699-1712; LONDON SPY 1698-1700; MEMOIRS FOR THE INGENIOUS 1693; WORKS OF THE LEARNED 1691-2. Future subscription issues will include MISCELLANEOUS LETTERS 1694-6.

(233) *HOLYBAND*. Claudius Holyband, *THE FRENCH LITTLETON*, 1609 ed., intro by M. St. Clare Byrne. Cambridge U.P., 1953, 254p.—A charming guide to French by Claude de Sainliens, the Huguenot refugee who wrote variously as Claud a Sancto Vinculo, Claudius Holyband, etc.; it is important for grammarians & historians of education. Also on Holyband, see K. Lambley, *Teaching & Cultivation of the French Language in England 1920 & the 1908 dissertation by L.E. Farrer*.

(234) *LITERATURE EAST & WEST*, the newsletter of the MLA conference on oriental-western literary relations, is edited by G. L. Anderson & published from New York University, New York 53, N.Y. (\$1 a year). It covers the culture of the Middle & Far East, with observation extensive from China to (almost) Peru & involves a vast range of centuries, including a variety of items on the 17C.

(235) *A JAPANESE 17th-Century News* is issued by a small group of Japanese teachers of English in Tokyo who are devoted to 17C English literature, its cultural & religious background, & related subjects. An issue covering activities of the group for 1954-55 has reached this editor—fortunately with translations of key points added by Mr. Shonosuke Ishii. *Résumés* (in Japanese) are provided of speeches on Anglicanism, recent studies of Metaphysical Poets, the Idea of Time in 17C Poetry, Cowley, etc. We are delighted to find on pp. 11-13 a list of books reviewed in our own *NEWS* & take particular pleasure in being listed as an Honorary Member of the Group. Dare we hope thus to become "the Hon Patrick"?

#### TO THE EDITOR

(i) *DEAR SIR*: I was surprised to see on page 45 of the *Seventeenth Century News* (Winter 1955) the statement "A reviewer commented that the product reminded him of Pickwick's secretary on Chinese philosophy!" Actually, Mr. Pickwick had no secretary. He was informed by Mr. Pott, the editor of the *Eatanswill Gazette*, how a critic had crammed for a copious review on a work on Chinese metaphysics—"He read for metaphysics under the letter M, and for China under the letter C; and combined his information." I trust that addiction to seventeenth-century tracts does not lead Miltonians in general to the neglect of nineteenth-century classics. *Yours very truly*, Godfrey Davies (*Huntington Library*).

(Our correspondent is right about Pott etc., wrong, we hope, about Miltonians & 19C classics. The reviewer referred to has his facts straight; our editorial memory twisted them.)

(ii) You scoundrel! On page 30 of the Autumn 1955 *NEWS* I find the name "Elizabeth Schneider." It's "Elisabeth." I wrote her on the strength of your mention—that is, I wrote to "z." She says I must mean "s," the other Schneider. See PMLA roster as documentary evidence of this colossal slip. Suggest you devote entire issue to apology to both Schneiders."

(Humbly we point out that the author of *COLERIDGE, OPIUM, & KUBLA KHAN* is Temple University's "s.")

(iii) "... In item 76 of the Autumn 1955 issue (abstract of George's review of the Yale Milton I), paragraph 4, 1st line, read: 'It is not considered that Hall attacked Shakespeare & Spenser.'"

(iv) "... I wish to thank you for the excellent job you are doing on the *News*. It is most helpful to me, especially since I am a primary example of Prof. Hiddenaway at Isolation College. ..."

(v) "... You marked my last copy with a notice that my subscription expired, but on examining my records I find that I sent you a check for \$1.00 only three months ago. Are you trying to cheat me? ..."

(Here is the answer we dared not send: Dear Professor Pennywise:—According to OUR records, you originally wrote & asked if you might have two free sample copies of the *NEWS*. We sent vol. XI, nos. 2 & 3. In the following June you sent \$1 & asked to have the subscription begin with vol. XII, no. 1. So we sent vol. XII, nos. 1 & 2, as they were issued, nos. 3 & 4, & then notified you that your subscription ended with 4. You ignored our notice, but we sent vol. XIII, nos. 1 & 2 in expectation that you would renew. Eventually, in October, 1955, you sent us \$1 & included a complaint that vol. XI, no. 3 was missing from your file (though

you had never subscribed for vol. XI). So we sent that issue &, rather than argue, did not charge you for it. Your renewal expired with vol. XIII, no. 4. But because your check for that volume reached us 10 months late, you are now claiming what amounts to almost a full extra year for nothing. You already have wangled 3 free issues out of us. Now because of your lateness in paying, you are trying to wangle 3 more. You have paid us a grand total of two \$1 checks. We paid a bank charge of 10c on each of them. That left us \$1.80. On postage for issues not paid for & for letters & postcards to you we have expended 17¢, leaving us \$1.63—all that you have really paid. In return you expect 14 issues! Do you wonder that we cannot break even? Do you realize that we are unsubsidized?)

#### NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol II, #4 Spring 1956. Jointly with *17C NEWS*, \$1 a year to J. Max Patrick, 35-13 76th St, Jackson Heights 72, N.Y. Edited by JAMES R. NAIDEN, 11237 First Ave N.W., Seattle, Wash. & J. MAX PATRICK; devoted to Neo-Latin Literature, 1400-1950.

Contributors to this issue, other than the Editors, are: PAUL BLACKFORD, *Western Illinois State*, who graciously prepared the report on the MLA meeting; ROBERT O. EVANS, *Kentucky*; HANFORD HENDERSON, *American Univ.*

WE EARNESTLY BEG READERS TO CONTRIBUTE TO *NEO-LATIN NEWS*. The area is vast & access to relevant periodicals is often difficult. Please do not hesitate to send in an abstract of an article you have read or a review of a book you have read which treats Neo-Latin material. The number of scholars interested in Neo-Latin literature who subscribe to this pioneer newsletter is so small that ordinarily we do not receive review copies of books from publishers. Therefore base such reviews on your own or library copies.

(1) THE 5TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON MODERN LATIN STUDIES, meeting in conjunction with the MLA convention, took place in Chicago on Dec. 29, 1955. Through the cooperation of P. O. Kristeller, members were able to give unofficial consideration to certain problems of publication relating to Medieval & Renaissance Latin Translations & Commentaries. Leicester Bradner reported that the checklist of 16C Latin writings undertaken by himself & D. C. Allen is now in the hands of the Renaissance Society. No extended report on the project in Neo-Latin lexicography was given, but Paul Blackford offered copies of the outline of that project to those present. The continued progress of J. R. Naiden's cooperative history of modern Latin literature (1400-1600) was noted. Members heard a 20-minute abstract from an article prepared for the history by Johannes Gaertner (Lafayette College) on *Latin Verse Translations of the Bible 1500-1620*; he treated chiefly the metrical translations of the psalms & a lively discussion followed.

The Knights of Columbus Foundation Vatican Mss Microfilm Depository, housed at St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo., was described by Walter J. Ong, S.J. He revealed that the depository will contain microfilms of 30,000 codices, or of about 600,000 folia, when the present segment of the project is completed. This number is exclusive of certain satellite projects which have been undertaken at St. Louis University, e.g., the microfilming of the Jesuit Archives in Rome. The Vatican Library manuscripts catalogues have also been filmed and are on file with the depository. Though the microfilms are available for the use of scholars who can see them at St. Louis University, they cannot be sent out on loan; however, photostats of particular folia can be ordered. Interested persons are requested to address their inquiries to Mr. James V. Jones, University Librarian, or to Mr. Charles Ermatinger, Depository Librarian. Two tasks have been undertaken by members of the St. Louis University faculty who have formed a Renaissance and Mediaeval Research Pool: the first, an index of the depository; the second, a checklist of translations desiderata. The latter is an attempt to determine major English translation needs from Latin works of the Renaissance and Middle Ages. Scholars are especially urged to give their attention to this task. Further information can be had from Professor Chauncey Finch, Department of Classics, St. Louis University.

Dr. J. R. Naiden and Professor Ralph Condee were again elected to the positions of chairman and secretary, respectively, of the conference.

(2) *HUMANISTIC & POLITICAL LITERATURE IN FLORENCE & VENICE AT THE BEGINNING OF THE QUATTROCENTO* by HANS BARON (Fellow of the Newberry Library). Harvard University Press, 1955, 223p, \$4.75. Review by PAUL BLACKFORD, *Western Illinois State College*.—To demonstrate the influence of the political struggle involving on the one side Florence and Venice and on the other the Visconti of Milan upon



the growth of Florentine Humanism at the beginning of the Quattrocento, and to promote the thesis that the transition from Trecento to Quattrocento culture was not a gradual evolution, but a movement quickened or deflected by the political experiences resulting from the struggle between unifying despotism (Milanese) and city-state freedom (Florentine and Venetian). Dr. Baron reexamines certain literary documents of the period, both Latin and Volgare, and reconstructs their chronology. Relegating to the third decade of the fifteenth century Giovanni da Prato's *Paradiso Degli Alberti*, upon the earlier dating of which (1389) existing theories about the emergence of Florentine thought depend (e.g., A. Della Torre's and V. Rossi's), Dr. Baron turns his attention to Milanese and Florentine polemic and propaganda tracts—Antonio Loschi's *Invectiva in Florentinos*, Cino Rinuccini's *Risponsiva*, and Coluccio Salutati's *Invectiva in Antonium Luschum Vicentinum*—and finds in them the earliest signs (1397-1403) of a new political and historical outlook, emerging in the midst of the ideological conflict between the Italian states. The redating of Bruni's *Dialogus I* (1401) and his *Laudatio Florentinae Urbis* and *Dialogus II* (1403-1406), as well as of Gregorio Dati's *Istoria di Firenze* (1407-1410), makes them precursors of the work which Dr. Baron considers the "magnum opus" of the period, Bruni's *Historiae Florentini Populi*. The results of this piece of literary detective work are, first, a clarification of what has been, to this time, a confused, and sometimes puzzling, theory about the dating of certain cardinal literary documents of the early Quattrocento, and, second, a new picture of the relationship existing between political activities and literary output in Florence in the early fifteenth century, with a new understanding of the intellectual climate in Italy at that time. Neo-Latinists will take particular notice of the many problems having to do with manuscripts and original and edited texts with which Dr. Baron had to deal in the course of his work. His book points up the present confused and unsatisfactory state of Renaissance Latin manuscripts and texts. If Dr. Baron's work makes a substantial contribution to the reduction of the present chaos to order—and there can be little doubt that it does—it also brings clearly into focus the amount of work which remains to be done before any final synthesis can be made.

(3) RECENT BOOK CATALOGUES. (i) Wm H. Schab, 602 Madison Ave NYC 22, catalogue XXI lists Blaeu's 11-vol. *Atlas major* (\$1850); the rare 1533 ed. of Peter Martyr's *Decades tres*; & *Bibliotheca Chalcographica* (1645)-1653 by J-J Boissard & C. Ammon—with 490 portraits of great men of the Renaissance—probably the most comprehensive collection of its type; also a set of unique mss with over 700 designs of emblems pertaining to important people by Octavian Strada, Prague: 1584-1600; an imprint which establishes that Gerson Soncino operated a printing press at Ancona; Pierre Belon's *De admirabili operum antiquorum*, 1553, one of the earliest works which treat gasoline (Petroleum vulgo naphta dicitur); & a variety of other works.

(ii) The frequently issued catalogues of the Export Book Company, 63 Havelock Terrace, Garstang Rd, Preston, Lancs. England, usually contain Neo-Latin items with prices within the range of professors' salaries; e.g., cat. 527 lists A. Jonstoni, *POEMATATA OMNIA* (Middelb. Zeland, 1642), at 1 guinea.

(iii) *Mercurius Britannicus*, the monthly catalogue issued by Maggs Bros, 50 Berkeley Sq, London W1, is chiefly devoted to works in English but occasionally lists Latin items, such as item 1016 in no. 149 for Dec. 1955—Jonathan Swift's copy of the *Opera* of Valerius Maximus (Venice, 1505).

(iv) Cat. 146 issued by Horace G. Commin, 100 Old Christchurch Rd, Bournemouth, England, chiefly lists English works but includes a variety of herbals in Neo-Latin & several mss, e.g. *Martinus Polonus, CHRONICA SUMMORUM PONTIFICUM ET IMPERATORUM* (15c French, 215 vellum leaves, £120—a chronicle of papal & sacred history up to 1430 (1st printed, Turin 1477); also a variety of inexpensive Neo-Latin items.

(v) Cat. 628 from Blackwell's, Broad St., Oxford, England, lists 3 pages of books by or about Erasmus.

(vi) Cat. 15 from Emily Driscoll, 115 E 40 St, NYC, lists as item 292, for \$295, 13 leaves of ms verse closely written in double columns: "Select Epigrammes of Martial Englished," "Other Epigrammes ancient and moderne," "Epigrammes or Sentences Epigrammelike," "Epigrammes by mee long since made in Latine and of late Englished." The unknown writer used a variety of verse forms. Among the moderns he translated are: BEZA, GROTIUS, SIDNEY, MONTAIGNE, OWEN, DONNE, SIR JOHN DENHAM.

(vii) Cat. 153 from Davis & Orioli, c/o National Provincial Bank, 8 Notting Hill Gate, London W.11 lists *inter alia* the rare *Dialectica Nova* by Georgius Benignus (G. Drachisich), 1488; Philippus Beroaldus's *Declamatio lepidissima* 1505, in which personifications of drunkenness, lewdness & gambling argue which is superior; a rare educational manual, *Libellus de utilitate et harmonia artium* by Nicolaus Brontius, 1541; & Pacificus Maximus, *Elegiae nonnullae*

*lae iocosae et festivae*, 1523, which contains elegant & ultra obscene Latin poems, including "In Priapum" which is said to describe the symptoms of syphilis three years before the discovery of America; also many works on medicine & science.

(4) BARCLAY. G. Schultz-Behrend, "Optiz' Übersetzung von Barclays ARGENTIS" *PMLA* 70:3 (Jun55)455-73:—Argenis, 1621, was translated in 1626 *nach dem Frantzösischen*, the 2nd part in 1631. Translation began in July 1626, following the anon. Fr. transl. of 1623 & the Latin ed. of Frankfurt 1623. The "Petronian" style of Barclay influenced the German expression in ten prominent traits of style; Optiz also tended to overwork the noun & use pleonasm such as "willing und gerne." The author concludes that the writing of *Argenis* in Latin in 1621 was an archaizing happenstance, for the "Gefühle, Gesinnung, und Ideale," & the structure arise from the Baroque. (Should this *en passant* remark in a carefully assembled article, about Latin being in 1621 an archaistic affectation, pass without objection? One of the objectives of scholarship in this field should be to show that Latin was a leading medium, not an antiquated one, for new ideas & mannerisms & vocabulary until perhaps 1700, & that it has continued to influence intellectual history. Latin was a logical choice for an author in 1621. Petronius was probably not Barclay's model, for most of Petronius' work was discovered in Dalmatia in 1650; only fragments were known before that.)

(5) CHINA IN THE 16TH CENTURY: THE JOURNALS OF MATTHEW RICCI 1583-1610, transl. by L.J. Gallagher, S.J. (N.Y.: Random House 1953, 116p) has been devastatingly reviewed by Antonio Sisto Rosso from Rome, in *CATH.HIST.REV* 40:2 (Jul54). He says that G should have translated Ricci's original Italian, published critically in 1911-13 & again in 1949, & not Trigault's Latin version. Rosso castigates Gallagher for not being more proficient in Chinese studies, for using terminology too modern, & for translating the wrong book wrongly.

(6) "De MATHIA CASIMIRO SARBIESKI Polonorum Horatio" by A. Bacci. *Latinitas* 2:2 (Apr54)94-101:—Review of life & characteristic excerpts of the poetry without discussion of the ideas made familiar to us by Miss Røstvig. Calls attention to various works of S. reported preserved in ms, including *De perfecta poesi libri IV* (477p); *De acuto et arguto liber unicus*; *Dii gentium*, etc. Present conditions in Poland prevented investigation about the current existence of these mss.

(7) *RATIO STUDIORUM* 1599. G.E. Gauss, S.J. "The 4th Part of St. Ignatius' Constitutions & the Spirit of the Ratio Studiorum," *STUDIULLA CHIESA ANTICA E SULL'UMANESIMO*, *ANALECTA GREGORIANA* 70, 163-80:—The *RATIO STUDIORUM* of 1599 came at a moment when Europe was still a respublica litteraria Latina; it is based upon the 4th part of Ignatius' CONSTITUTIONS & must be read with the idea that the Ratio presupposed & aimed to carry into practice with the greatest possible efficiency for its own era, the group of comprehensive principles of Catholic education of St. Ignatius. It is a mistake to regard the Ratio as a collection of regulations & administrative practices.

(8) Ernest H. Wilkins, "Petrarch's *Epistolae Metricae* to Pietro Alighieri," *MP* 51:2 (Aug53)9:—The controversial epistle appears to answer a report from Alighieri that Florence was willing to reconsider its exiles. By this time Petrarch had other interests in Parma, Padua, & Avignon & declined: "the confiscated patrimony was never restored to him."—EVANS

(9) ANN BRADSTREET:—The recent purchase by the Stevens Memorial Library, North Andover, Mass., of the only known ms of "the first significant woman poet in the English language & the first American poet of either sex" is a reminder that the contents include a Latin translation of the first 4 of her 76 "Meditations" & their dedication by her great-grandson Simon Bradstreet (Harvard, 1728). These are to be found in the 1932 edition of her works. Her TENTH MUSE was mentioned in the critical dictionary of poets published in London in 1675 by Milton's nephew Edward Phillips.

(10) PONTANUS. W.H. Bond "A Printer's Manuscript of 1508" *Studies in Bibliography*, ed. Fredson Bowers, VIII (Bibliog. Soc. of the U. of Virginia, 1956)147-56:—The British Museum ms of *De Prudentia* by Joannes Jovianus Pontanus, the Neapolitan humanist (d. 1503) is one of the few examples of early printer's copy which have survived. "It testifies to Summonte's meticulous editorial preparation, which even extended to some attempt at typographical design, & it shows clearly how the printer treated the text." The scholarly editor & scholarly printer worked in harmony. The article includes 4 pages of reproduction from the ms.

(11) "JOHN ROUS, BODLEY'S LIBRARIAN" by Sir Edmund Craster, *BODL.LIBREC* 5:3 (Jul55)130-47:—Milton addressed Rous as "doctissimus probusque aestimator librorum"—rightly, for R's only recorded saying was, "Mentiri nescio. Librum si malus est nequeo laudare." He received for the Library the Barocci & Roe collections of Greek mss, Kenelm Digby's medieval

**17TH-CENTURY NEWS & NEO-LATIN NEWS**  
**35-13 76 ST., JACKSON HEIGHTS 72, N. Y.**  
**RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED**

Double Issue. Vol. XIV. Nos. 1 & 2  
 Spring & Summer, 1956.

Back issues of the NEWS since 1950 (and a few copies of some issues before 1950) are obtainable for 25¢ a copy from Ray Armstrong, English Department, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS, ed. J. Max Patrick, is the official organ of the Milton Society of America & of the English VI (Period of Milton) section of the Modern Language Association & is devoted to all aspects of 17C culture except Shakespeare.

SUBSCRIPTIONS (with Neo-Latin News): \$1 a year sent to J. M. Patrick, 35-13 76th St., Jackson Heights 72, N.Y. (Britain: 8s for 2 years, sent to J. C. Maxwell, King's College, Newcastle-on-Tyne—notify J. M. Patrick that you have done so. Europe: 320 fr for 2 years sent to Prof. J-J Denonain, Faculté des Lettres C.C.P. Alger). A CHECKMARK BELOW INDICATES THAT YOU SHOULD RENEW, preferably for 2, 3 or 4 years @ \$1 a year, in cash (preferably) or check PAYABLE TO J. MAX PATRICK. Your EXPIRATION DATE: before Winter 1955 ☐; Winter 1955 ☐; Spring 1955 (this issue) ☐; Summer 1955 (this issue) ☐; Autumn 1955 (next issue) ☐.

We need more subscribers. Please see that your library subscribes. Give subscriptions as gifts.

collection, 1300 mss from Laud, & a choice of Robert Burton's books.

(12) A COLLECTION OF LATIN POEMS & EPITAPHS MADE BY GEORGE ALLAN of Darlington has been purchased by the Bodleian Library—*Musarum Anglicarum analecta sive Poemata quaedam melioris notae, seu hactenus inedita, seu sparsim edita*, 1757; 19 of the poems were recited in Oxford in 1733.

(13) "HUMANISTIC EDUCATION & THE HIERARCHY OF VALUES IN THE RENAISSANCE" by Linton C. Stevens. In *Renaissance Papers* 1955 (see this issue of 17C News, item 230):—Methods, purposes, & characteristics of Renaissance Latin didactic treatises are quite different from earlier similar works. Humanists of France, Germany & the Low Countries were interested in training bourgeois youths for professions & paid considerable attention to moral questions as well as to stylistics (e.g., Jacob Wimpheling's anthology, *Adolescentia*, & his teachers' handbook, *Isodoneus*), & grammar (e.g. Mathurin Cordier's *Principia Latine loquendi*). Most humanists of repute wrote treatises on epistolography: Politian, Sadoletto, Bembo, Budé, Erasmus, More, Agri-cola, Hutten, Vives. Vocabulary was furthered by colloquies: Erasmus had many imitators in this respect—Sebaldus Heyden, *Formulae puerilium colloquiorum*; 42 dialogues by Barlandus; etc. In French, German & Swiss elementary schools, study of grammar became more functional; students were trained to speak & write Latin as soon as possible in a style which included poetic, vulgar, archaic & Neo-Latin words. Moral & religious education attempted to identify ancient with Christian virtues. Rhetoric &

stylistics were combined in secondary education with a varied literary program. Mysterious powers were attributed to rhetoric: language is educative *per se*; rejuvenescence of language may lead to renewal of life; restoration of original purity & nobility to language can ennoble human character.

(14) "THOMAS JAMES, CONCORDANTIAE SANCTORUM PATRUM, 1607" by J.N.L. Myres. *BodLibRec* 5:4(Oct55)212 17:—Only 6 copies (none in America) survive of at least 78 which were printed & distributed by the author as a specimen set of references to patristic commentators on the Bible.

(15) "SYPHILIS & THE POETIC IMAGINATION: JEAN LEMAIRE DE BELGES & GIROLAMO FRACASTORO" By Wm H. Myer. *Renaissance Papers* 1955 (See 17C News item 230), 75-79:—Fracastro in *Syphilis sive Morbus Gallicus* 1530 associates the disease poetically with hazards of war & discovery, movements of Nature & the Heavens; man may conquer it through works of his mind & spirit. Lemaire's French work is practical & worldly wise.

(16) POMPONAZZI. Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Two Unpublished Questions on the Soul of Pietro Pomponazzi" *Medievalia et Humanistica* 9:76-101:—Describes present state & future tasks of scholarship concerning Pomponazzi's unpublished works & development of his doctrine of immortality before 1516 & publishes here for the first time the POMPONAZZI QUESTIO DE IMMORTALITATE ANIMAE from the Naples Bibl. Naz. MS VIII D81.—HENDERSON



